Literary Criticism in Tamil and Sanskrit

(Tolkāppiyam - Poruḷatikāram and Sanskrit Alaṁkāra Śāstra)

Dr. K. Meenakshi

International Institute of Tamil Studies

உலகத் தமிழாராய்ச்சி நிறுவனம்

Literary Criticism in Tamil and Sanskrit

(Tolkãpiyam - poruḷatikãram and
Sanskrit Alaṁkãra S̃ãstra)

Dr. K. Meenakshi

International Institute of Tamil Studies

Tharamani - Chennai - 600 113

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Title	:	**Literary Criticism in Tamil and Sanskrit**
Author	:	**Dr. K. Meenakshi**
Publisher	:	**International Institute of Tamil Studies,** C.I.T. Campus, Tharamani, Chennai - 600 113.
Publication No	:	344
Language	:	English
Date of Publication	:	1999
Edition	:	First
Paper Used	:	TNPL 18.6kg Super printing
Size of the book	:	1/8 Demy
Printing types	:	10 points
No.of Pages	:	152
Price	:	Rs.45/- (Rupees Fourty Five Only)
No.of Copies	:	1200
Subject	:	Literary Criticism
Wrapper Design	:	V. Karunanithy
Printed by	:	***The PARKAR*** 293, Ahamed Complex, 2nd Floor, Royapettah High Road, Chennai - 600 014. Ph : 8215684

Dr. S. S. Ramar Ilango
Director
International Institute of Tamil Studies
Tharamani, Chennai - 113.

Foreword

This work is a comparative study of the literary theories and criticism expounded in the Tamil and Sanskrit texts, chiefly Tolkappiyam Porulatikaram and Sanskrit alamkara texts. The author of the book Dr. K. Meenakshi has worked as a Professor in Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi and then as a Visiting Professor at this Institute. She is an eminent scholar in Tamil, Linguistics, Sanskrit and History. Her book `Tolkappiyam and Ashtadyayi' published by this Institute received the DLA award. I congratulate her for her scholarly work, `Literary Criticism in Tamil and Sanskrit'.

I express my sincere thanks to Hon'ble Dr. M. Thamizhkudimagan, Chairman of International Institute of Tamil Studies, Minister for Tamil Official Language and Tamil Culture and Hindu Religious Charitable Endowment for his untiring support for the development of International Institute of Tamil Studies.

I wish to express my thanks to Mr. S. Ramakrishnan I.A.S., Secretary of Tamil Development - Culture and Religious Endowments for his encouragement in the activities of this Institute.

My sincere thanks to The Parkar' for the neat and prompt execution of the work.

Director

Contents

		Page No.
	Foreward	
	Preface	
I.	Introduction	.. 1
II.	Tolkāppiyam - Poruḷatikāram	.. 5
III.	Sanskrit Alaṁkāra Texts	.. 44
IV.	Literary Criticism in Tamil and Sanskrit : A comparison	.. 91
V.	Conclusion	.. 123
	Bibliography	.. 127
	Index	.. 132

Preface

Considerable number of literature enquiring into the relationship between Tamil and Sanskrit grammatical traditions has been appearing for over a period of time. Tamil tradition represented by its earliest grammatical work known as *Tolkāppiyam* includes a section on *poruḷ* or subject matter in the *Poruḷatikāram* which is comparable with the *sāhitya* or *alaṁkāra sāstra* of the Sanskrit tradition. As *alaṁkāra* forms a separate branch of study a comparative study of the Tamil and Sanskrit tradition should be made separately, one comprising the grammatical aspect and the other the literary aspect. A comparative study of the *Tolkāppiyam* and the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* has been made by the author and is being published by the International Institute of Tamil studies Chennai a couple of years ago. I address myself to the literary aspect in this book.

Comparative studies, attempted earlier, reflects an underlying assumption that the *Poruḷatikāram* of Tamil tradition is posterior to the Sanskrit *alaṁkāra* texts; accordingly an attempt has been made to point out the similarities between the two traditions thereby establishing the indebtedness of Tamil tradition to the Sanskrit tradition. When a compartive study of two traditions is to be made, a researcher has to take into consideration, one the chronology of the traditions under review so that one can speak of the influence of anterior tradition on the posterior tradition and two the common topics and their similarities. The vexed question of relative chronology has been posing a problem and until and unless this question is resolved to the satisfaction of each and everyone concerned, one becomes sceptical to accept the view of posteriority or anteriority of either tradition. Moreover almost all *alaṁkāra* texts,

excepting Bharata's *Nāṭyaśātra* are placed later than *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram*. Secondly the similarities found in these two traditions need not be taken always due to the influence of one on the other. They may be purely accidental and may have developed independant of each other.

Comparative studies attempted earlier take the common topics such *as uḷḷuṟai, iraicci* and *dhvani* and try to point out the similarities in Tamil and Sanskrit. It requires or some rethinking since the common topics treated in Tamil and Sanskrit may not be similar in their treatments as well. A careful study of *Tolkāppiyam-Poruḷatikāram* shows that the treatment of these topics in Tolkāppiyam differs from that of Sanskrit *ālaṁkārikas*. Therefore, it is necessary to first discuss the method of treatment of common topics in Tamil and Sanskrit traditions. The present study is divided into five sections, They are 1) introduction 2) *Tolkāppiyam-Poruḷatikāram* 3) Sanskrit *alaṁkāra* texts 4) A comparative study of Tamil and Sanskrit traditions which is mainly concerned with the discussion on the treatment of simile, suggestion and sentiments and 5 conclusion.

It has been established that Tamil tradition represented by *Tolkappiyam-Poruḷatikāram* differs from that of Sanskrit *ālaṁkārikas* in the treatment of simile, suggestion and sentiment though these are found to be common topics. Tolkāppiyar treats of all these within the framework of *akam* theme, whereas in the Sanskrit tradition they are found to have much wider scope. The question of Sanskrit influence on Tamil tradition may have been brought in by the commentators as the influence of Sanskrit on Tamil was greater during their period and majority of the commentators happened to be well-versed in both the languages.

Transliteration and abbreviations followed in this book are normally accepted ones, no separate system of transliteration and abbreviation are not given here.

Acknowledgement

I undertook this project during my tenure as the visiting professor at the International Institute of Tamil Studies (IITS), Chennai. I wish to express my heart felt thanks to the selection committee for selecting me and thereby giving me an opportunity to complete Tolkāppiyam comparative study.

I am very grateful to Dr. S. S. Ramar Ilango, Director, IITS, Chennai, for his encouragement and help to work on this project. My heartfelt thanks are also due to him for getting this work published.

My sincere thanks are due to Dr. Rajalaksmi Srinivasan and her husband Mr. Srinivasan of Chennai, who helped me in various ways. I am very greateful to the couple who made my stay at Chennai very comfortable and enjoyable.

I consulted a number of libraries for this research project. I wish to express my thanks to Mr. M. K. Kulkarni, Librarian. Deccan College Library, Pune and his colleagues; Ms. R. Parvathy, Librarian and Mr. G. Venkatachalapathy of the IITS. Library Chennai; Ms. Prema, Librarian, Kuppuswamy Sastri Research Institute, Chennai for their help.

My thanks are also due to Ms. Kameswari, of Kuppuswamy Sastri Research Institute, Chennai.

I am thankful to Ms. S. Sitalakshmi for her ready help in the proof correction.

My thanks are due to Mr. and Mrs. Khurjekar of Mac Script for neatly type setting the work.

Pune

24.3.1999

K. Meenakshi

I. Introduction

Section I : Introduction

Western scholars have written a large number of works on literary criticism than literary composition itself. In the Indian subcontinent itself, Sanskrit language can claim a continuous tradition of literary criticism beginning from the *Nātsayaśāstra* of Bharata for more than eighteen hundred years. Later writers on poetics have developed what Bharata had postulated earlier, to an enormous extent, that it attained the status of being called a *śāstra*, thereby developing it into a separate branch of study called *Alaṁkāra śāstra*. All the works on the history of Sanskrit literature include a section on poetics; apart from this, two monumental works on the History of Poetics (De and Kane) also are available in Sanskrit. The tradition of Sanskrit criticism still continue and a number of scholars, including westorn, are contributing to this field of study.

Tamil language, on the other hand, gives not so bright picture. Though Tolkappiyar, the earliest grammarian has postulated a number of such theories in his work *Tolkāppiyam* his poetic theories have not developed further. As a result, Tamil tradition, has practically none on the literary criticism after *Tolkāppiyam-Poruḷatikāram*. There is no doubt, that ancient Tamil poets have written a large number of works based on the literary themes postulated by Tolkappiyar unfortunately none of the ancient Tamil poets cared to develop what was spoken of by Tolkappiyar regarding rhetorics, suggestion, sentiments etc. They simply followed what was laid down about the theory of poetry and composed several

poems.The *alaṁkāra* works such as *Taṇṭiyalamkāram*, *Māraṉalaṁkāram* and so on arose later but, they were written on Sanskrit model. Tolkāppiyar's theories on poetics, prepounded in *Poruḷatikāram* is purely a Tamil tradition.

Tamil grammatical works have the unique distinction of having a section on Poruḷ or subject matter included in the grammatical text itself unlike the Sanskrit tradition in which the study of poetics form a separate branch of study. Tolkappiyar formulates rules for not only literary themes but also includes sections on sentiments, suggestion, simile and so on in the third section of the grammatical text called *Tolkāppiyam*. Incidentally, the purpose of writing *Tolkāppiyam* is to give guidelines to write a good poetry according to some scholars. This tradition has been continued till Dandin's *Taṇṭiyalaṁkāram* appeared. Dandin's *alaṁkāra* work, treats of embellishment in a separate treatise, unlike Tolkappiyar, this work is supposed to be mainly based on Sanskrit *alṁkāras*.

Medieval commentators interpret a number of *Tolkāppiyam* sutras in the light of Sanskrit rhetorics. Following the trend set up by the medieval commentators, the modern writers also have entered into the discussion on the relationship between Tamil and Sanskrit traditions. Some scholars argue *Tolkāppiyam* reveals the influence of Bharata's Nātyaśastra in his description of sentiments. When we read carefully the *Meypāṭṭiyal oj Tolkāppiyam-Poruḷatikāram* it becomes very clear that there is no such relationship as borrower and borrowed. It will be shown in the following pages, their approach to the subject, the differences in their approaches and so on. When we observe vast differences between the two, the question of influence does not arise at all. Therefore a fresh approach to the subject is necessary; setting aside the irrelevant arguments, it is better to cultivate a sense of appreciation in reading through the sutras of *Tolkāppiyam* and Sanskrit *alaṁkara* texts. When we make a comparative

study of both the tradition with an unbiased mind, we will be able to appreciate better the theories postilated by *Tolkāppiyam* much earlier than the Sanskrit tradition. The present study is an attempt in these lines.

The main object of this comparative study is to present first, the views on the literary themes and literary criticism as discribed in Tamil and Sanskrit texts. *Tolkāppiyam Prulatikāram* is concerned with the literary themes and criticisms in the section on *Meyppātu* or sentiments, *uvamai* or simile, *ullurai uvamam* and *iraicci* or suggestion. It is well known that Sanskrit *alaṁkāra* texts deal with a number of theories including *rasa* or sentiment, *upama* or simile, *dhvani* or suggestion. Since the *Tolkappiyam* stresses on *meyppātū, ullurai uvamam* and *iraicci* and *enai uvamam*, and the object of this study is to compare Tolkappiyam with Sanskrit tradition, the study will be limited to the literary themes particularly erotic poetry, and the theories of *rasa, alaṁkāra* and *dhvani* as these topics are commonly found in these two traditions.

This work has been divided into five sections. Section I forms the introduction (2) *Tolkāppiyam-Prulatikāram* (3) Sanskrit *alaṁkāra* literature (4) A comparative study of literary themes and theories as found in Tamil and Sanskrit traditions and (5) conclusion.

Introduction briefly discusses the necessity for a fresh approach and the outcome of such approach.

Section II : Tolkāppiyam-Prulatikāram

Section II *Tolkāppiyam-Prulatikāram* presents the contents of *prulatikāram*. It discribes in detail the literary theme and theories discussed in this section of *Tolkāppiyam*. Tolkappiyar appears to be more concerned with the *akam* theme as majour part of *prulatikāram* is devoted to this theme. Hence the scope of this study will be on *Akattinaiyiyal*, *Kalaviyal*, *Karpiyal* and *Poruliyal* for literary theme and *Meypāttiyal*,

Uvamaiyal and relevant sutres for *uḷḷuṟai uvaman* and *iṟaicci* in the section on *Akattiṇai* etc for poetics. Apart from these, relevant sutres from *Cayyuḷiyal* also will be included in this study.

Section III : *Alaṁkāra Śāstra* in Sanskrit

This section opens with an outline of the origin and development of Sanskrit *Kāvya* and poetics. Since *meyppāṭu*, *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* and *iraicci* and *uvamam* are comparable respectively with *rasa* theory, *upamā* or embellishment theory and *dhvani* or suggestion theory of Sanskirt literary critics, detailed discussion on the *rasa* theory of *Bharata* and his followers, *dhvani* theory of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta, and *alaṁkara* theory of the well known rhetoricians such as Udbhaṭa and others find a place in this section.

Section IV : Comparative study

The common topics handled by both Tamil and Sanskirt writers is the treatment of love with its different situations. Similarly sentiments *(rasa)* emlellishments *(alaṁkāra)* and suggestion, *(dhvani)* are said to correspond to *meyppāṭu, uvamai* and *uḷḷurai uvamam* and *iṟaicci* in Tamil. Hence these topics are compared. After pointing out the similarities and the differences in the treatment of these topics it is shown that these are not identical but are different. It has been established that these two systems are independant of each other.

Section V : Conclusion

Summing up of the discussions put forth in the preceding chapters and the conclusions.

□□

II. Tolkāppiyam -Poruḷati kāram

The earliest extant Tamil grammatical work called *Tolkāppiyam* devotes its third section i.e. *Poruḷatikāram* exclusively for the topics relating to literary theme, metrical patterns, poetics and tradition. This section, like the preceding two, is also divided into *iyals*. They are :-

1) *Akattiṇaiyiyal* (= *Akat.*), 2) *Purattiṇaiyiyal* (= *Puṟat*) 3) *Kaḷaviyal* (=*Kaḷavu*), 4)*Kaṟpiyal* (=*Kaṟpu.*) 5) *Poruḷiyal* (=*Poruḷ*), 6) *Meyppāṭṭiyal* (*Meyppāṭu*) 7) *Uvamaiyiyali* (= *Uvamai.*), 8) *Ceyyuḷiyal* (= *Ceyyuḷ*), and 9) *Marapiyal* (=*Marapu.*).

Tolkāppiyar's main thrust is on *akam* theme, as such, he devotes almost all the *iyals* (excepting) *Puṟat.* to formulate rules for writing poems on this theme, Even while prescribing rules for *puṟam* theme, he formulates rules in such a fasion that *puṟam* forms the other side ie opposite of *akam*. Consider the following sutras:-

veṭci tāṉe kuṟiñciyatu puṟanē (T.P. 56)

vañcitāṉē mullaiyatu puṟaṉē (T.P61)

uḷiñaitāṉe marutattup puṟaṉē (T.P. 64)

tumpaitāṉe neytalatu puṟaṉe (T.P. 66)

vākaitānē pālaiyatu puṟaṉē (T.P. 73)

kañcitāṉē peruntiṇaip puṟaṉē (T.P. 77)

All these sutras point to the fact that Tolkāppiyar considers *akam* as the main theme, which forms the basis for his concept of poetry.

As already pointed out majority of the sections in the *Poruḷatikaram* covers the literary theme of *akam*, and it is proposed to limit our study to this theme, a brief outline of all these *iyals* will he given here.

1. *Akattiṇaiyiyal*

Akat. forms the first section of the *Poruḷatikāram*. The topics dealt with in this section are as follows:- Classification of *akam* into seven *tiṇais*, the subject matter of *akattiṇai*, such as *mutal*, *karu* and *uri* , the character of *akam* theme, utterances of *talaivaṉ*, *tōḻī*, *naṟṟāy* and *kaṇṭōr*, elopement, separation, *kaikkiḷai*, *peruntiṇai*, metrical pattern, classification of *uvamam* (simile) into *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* and *eṉai uvamam* (implicit and explicit). All these topics are covered in 55 Sutras.

2. *Kaḷaviyal*

Kaḷavu. forms the third section of the *Poruḷatikāram*. It contains 51 sutras. The topics covered in this section are definition of *kaḷavu*, qualities of the hero *puṇarcci*, such as iyaṟkaippuṇarcci and ullappuṉarca and so on, behaviour of hero in *kalava* stage, heroine's reaction to the hero's advances, her friend's reactions. Foster mother's responses, heroine's mother's responses, steps taken by her mother and foster mother, secret meeting during day in a particular place, meeting in the other places than those specified ones by him, marriage (*varaital*). Public wedding may take place either before *kaḷavu* comes to the open or after their clandestine meetings are known to others, *pirivu* or separation before the actual wedding is normally do not happen. *kaḷavu* is almost similar to *kaṟpu* in their living together.

3. *Karpiyal*

Karpu. follows immediately after *kalavu*. It consists of 53 sutras. The topics covered in this section are : *karpu manam*, utterance of the hero, heroine, *tōli, cevili, kāmakkilatti, arivar, kūttan* and *ilaiyōr, ūtal* (sulking) gossip (*alar*), separation and penance.

4. *Poruliyal*

Porul. forms the 5th section of the *Porulatikāram*. Miscellancous topics are covered in this section. They are supplimentary to the previous sections. It describes further situations not covered by the previous sections during *kalavu* and *karpu* slages. The topics discussed in this section may be studied under 5 major divisions. 1) The qualities of the characters of *akam* poems 2) figures *ullurai* and *iraicci* 3) emotions which should remain hidden 4) Tradition and 5) Sanctioned deviations.

It is intended to present *akam* theme discussed by Tolkappiyar under two divisions :- Literary theme and literary theory. The abve mentioned sections can be considered for the former and *Meyppāttiyal* and *Uvamaiyiyal* and also *ullurai uvamam* and *iraicci* described in the other sections for the latter. *Ceyyuliyal* covers various topics relevant for both.

i) Literary theme

Tolkāppiyar divides the literary theme into two major classes, viz., *akam* or inner or private and *puram* or outside. Thus, *akam* poems cover the topics concerning the love affairs of the hero and the heroine, their secret meeting, the marriage separation and so on and *puram* poems treat of the hero's external activities, such as his heroism, maganimity and so on. Both *akam* and *puram* poems are further classified into differnt *tinai, turai* and so on. We will be concerned with only *akam* theme.

akam poems are divided into sevan *tiṇais*.

They are:

tiṇai

1. *kaikkiḷai* or one sided love
2. *kuṟiñci* or mountainous region
3. *pālai* or arid land
4. *mullai* or pasture land
5. *neytal* or littoral region
6. *maruatm* or agricultural land
7. *peruntinai* or excessive love

The middle five *tiṇais* (ii. 2-6) are known as *kātal* or *aṉpiṉ aintiṇai* or five love situation, as they form the locus of different situations associated with love.

One can notice the names of the five *tiṇais, kuriñci, mullai* etc., are the names of flowers as well. It is argued by scholars that the *tiṇais* or lands or regions are named after the flowers which ate grown and blossom in those areas.

The subject matter of these poems is further classified into *mutaṟ poruḷ* or times and seasons as appropriate to the five *akattiṇais* 2)*karupporuḷ* or poetic distinctive attribute of *akattiṇai* and 3) *uripporuḷ* or poetic aspect of love. Each *tiṇai* is assigned *mutal*, *karu* and *uripporuḷ*. *Mutaṟporuḷ* refers to *nilam* or land and *poḷutu* or time and latter is again divided into two, viz, *perum poḷutu* meaning divisions of year ie seasons and *ciṟu poḷutu* meaning divisions of day such as *kālai* or morning, *pakal* or noon.

Mutaṟ poruḷ

tiṇai	*nilam* or region	*poḻutu* (time): *perum* (long)	*poḻutu* (time): *ciṟu* (short)
1. *mullai*	*kāṭu* (forest)	*kār* (rainy season)	*mālai* (evening)
2. *kuṟiñci*	*malai* (mountain)	1. *kūtir* (autumn) 2. *muṉpaṉi*	*yāmam* (midnight)
3. *pālai*		1. *vēṉil* (spring) a) *iḷaveṉil* b) *mutuvēṉil* 2. *piṉpaṉi*	*naṇpakal* (noon)
4) *marutam*	*tīmpuṉal* (riverine)	--	1) *vaikarai* (Day break) 2) *vitiyal* (dawn)
5) *neytal*	*perumaṇal* (littoral)	--	*ēṟpātu*

Tolkāppiyar has not specified any particular season for *marutam* and *neytal*. Hence, it may be inferred all seasons are suitable for these two *tiṇais*.

uripporuḷ

	tiṇai	***love situation***
1.	*kuriñci*	*puṇartal* or union
2.	*pālai*	*pirital* or separation
3.	*mullai*	*iruttal* or patient waiting
4.	*neytal*	*iraṅkal* or pining
5.	*marutam*	*ūṭal* or sulking

Karupporuḷ

Tolkāppiyar lists *karupporuḷ* as *teyvam* (god), *uṇā* (food), *mā* (animal), *maram* (tree), *puḷ* (bird), *paṟai*(musical instrument) *ceyti* (occupation), *Yāḻ* (lute), - *pū* (flower), *nīr* (water), *ūr* (village). Each and every *tiṇai* is assigened all these *karupporuḷ* by the commentator Nacciṉār kkiniyar though Tolkappiyar himself, specifies only god /lord.

1. mullai

teyvam- māyōṉ (Viṣṇu); *uṇā-varaku, cāmai-matirai, mā - uḻai, puḷvāy, muyal; maram-koṉṟai, kuruntu; puḷ - kāṉakkōḻi, cēval; paṟai - ēṟukōt paṟai, ceyti- nilameytal,varaku kaṭṭal; yāl-mullai yāḻ; pū - mullai, piṭā, tala, toṉṟi. nīr - kāṉyāṟu; ūr - pāṭi, cēri, paḻḻi*

2. kuriñci

teyvam - cēyōṉ (Murukan) ; uṇā - aivaṉam (nel), tiṇai, mūṅkilarici; mā-puli, yāṉai, karaṭi, paṉṟi, maram - akil, āram, tēkku, timicu, vēṅkai, puḷ - kiḷi, mayil; paṟai - murukiyam, toṇṭakam; ceyti-tēṉ aḻittal, kiḻaṅku akaḻtal, tiṇai viḷaittal kiḷikatital; yāl-kuriñciyāḻ; pū-kāntaḷ, vēṅkai, cuṉaikkuvaḷai, nīr-aruvi, cuṉai; ūr-ciṟukuṭi, kuricci.

3. ***marutam***

teyvam-Vēntaṉ; uṇā-cennel, veṇṇel; mā-erumai, nīrnāy; maram-vañci, kāñci, marutam; puḷ-tārā, nīrkōḻi; parai - paṇamuḻavu, nellai kiṇai; ceyti-naṭutal, kaṭṭal, arital, kaṭavitutal; yāḻ-marutayāḻ; pū-tāmarai, kaḻunīr, nīr-yāṟṟunīr, maṉaikkiṇaṟu, poykai; ūrkaḷ(eṉpana);

4. ***neytal***

teyvam-Varuṇaṉ; uṇā-mīṉvilai, uppuviḷai, mā-umaṇ, pakaṭu; maram-puṉṉai, ñāḻal, kaṇṭal; puḷ-aṉṉam, aṉṟil; paṟai-mīṉkōtpaṟai; ceyti-mīṉpaṭuttal, uppuviḷaittal and selling them; yāḻ-neytalyāḻ; pū-kaitai, neytal, nīr-maṇar kiṇaṟu, uvark kuḻi; ūr-paṭṭiṉam, pākkam.

5. ***pālai***

uṇā-wealth plundered on the highway; *mā*-weak, elephant, tiger and *cennāy* (brown coloured dog); *maram-dried iruppai, ōmai, uḻiñai, ñemai; puḷ-kaḻuku, paruntu, puṟa; paṟai-cūṟaikōṭpaṟai, niraikōṭpaṟai; ceyti-āṟalaittal, cūraikōṭal; yāl-pālaiyāḻ; pū-marā, kurā, pātiri; nīr-aṟunīrkkūval, cuṉai; ūr-parantalai* that those are not included in *uripprul* i.e. *kaikkiḷai*.

Tolkāppiyar sanctions the interchange of *nilam* and *poḻutu* assigned to *tiṇais* (14), He further adds that such interchanges are allowed only in the case of *mutarpruḷ* and *karuppruḷ*. However, he prohibits interchange of *uripprul*. He further adds that interchanges are possible in those *tiṇais* that are not included in the *uripprul* i.e. *kaikkiḷai* and *peruntinai* in other words, these two *tiṇais* can happen in any of the four regions.

akam- poets, as a rule, are not supposed to use the proper name of the hero while composing poems on *akam* theme (Akaṭ. 5).

The people were classified and named according to *tiṇai* in which they live or according to their occupation in the ancient *Tamilakam*; accordingly two kinds of names occur in the *akam* poems. Names according to *tiṇai* is called *peyarppeyar* or regional e.g. *kāṉavar* or forest

folk, *verpan̲* or hillsman and so on and occupational names are known as *vin̲aippeyar*. e.g. *vēṭṭuvar* or hunter, *ulavar* or farmer and so on.

People are basically classified into 1) *uyarntor* and 2) *aṭiyōr* or *vin̲aivalar* ie. those who belong to upper class and those who work for the upper class. The people who are depicted as heroes are those who live in all these regions eccept *aṭiyor* and *vin̲ai-valar*.

Tolkāppiyar has stated *pirital* or separation as the *uripporuḷ* of *pālai*. He enumerates the causes for separation as education (*ōtal*), war (*pakai*) and message (*tūtū*) (TP 25). Education and message are mentioned as the causes for separation in the case of people of higher strata of society (26) Separation due to enmity or war is applicable only to the chieftains or kings. *Pakai* or war may be of two kinds, viz, meeting the enemy alone in the battle field or along with his friends. Hero's departure to earn wealth and his attraction towards prostitute are two additional reasons for separation between the lovers. The former happens in the *kaḷavu* stage and the latter in the *kar̲pu* stage.

Akam poems are described as dramatic monologue and the *dramatis personae* are *talaivan̲* or hero, *talaivi* or heroine, *tōḻi* or heroine's friend, *cevili* or heroine's foster mother, *nar̲r̲āy* or heroine's mother, *pāṅkan̲* or hero's friend, *tantai* or heroine's father and *parattai* or prostitute.

Tolkāppiyar lists the qualities expected of both the hero and heroine. The hero is expected to be well-educated, well-behaved, he should be of noble birth and also be rich. The heroine should be chaste, well-behaved, patient, possessed of entertaining nature and supportive of hero's kith and kin.

Akam poems, as prescribed by Tolkāppiyar should be in the form of *kūr̲r̲u* or utterances. These are the utterances of hero, heroine and others who are stated as the characters. Modern scholars translate it 'saying' for instance, *talaivi kūr̲r̲u* what 'the friend said' Tolkappiyar uses the term

munnam (TP 315) which denotes the qualified speaker and the qualified person to be spoken to, their activities and the utterances are defined in some sections of *Akat*. It centres around the close relationship which exists between the hero and the heroine on the one hand and the other characters on the other. Tolkappiyar mentions the utterances of the hero, heroine and heroine's friend and so on specifying the context in which they can speak. The characters who are entitled to speak at the stage of *kalavu*, *karpu*, etc. are stated in Ceyyuḷ. also and the persons who are spoken to. All the characters (except the hero and the heroine) enumerated above are the speakers and listerners too.

ii) Literary theories

Uvamaiyiyal or section on simile

In the opening sūtra of the section, Tolkāppiyar says that the simile (*uvamai*) is based on four principles; viz. 1) action, 2) effect, 3) form and 4) colour. (TP 276). Of these four points of resemblance, two or three may be mingled in simile (TP 277) i.e. it is not necessary to restrict to only one comparison in a poem. All the four may be compared with in the same.

Tolkāppiyar rules that the object with which the comparison is made should be superior to the object compared. (TP 278). He also sanctions the use of reverse kind of simile in the sutra 284. Reversed simile is comparable to *anyonyopama* of Dandin.

Basis (*nilaikkalan*) for comparison are said to be four (TP 279). They are : superiority, beauty, affection and heroism. He includes inferiority too as the fifth one (TP 280).

One can notice two sets for comparison. Though Tolkāppiyar himself has given no reason some scholars say that the second set of *uvamai* is based on the aim of the poet whereas the first set is based on the reason

which prompted the poet to make comparison. (Sundaramurthy: 1974) It may be added here that the sutras under consideration are not formulated with the identical words. Thus, TP 276, one finds *vakai peravantav-uvamait tōṟṟam*. TP 279 has, *aṉṉār paṇbu nilaikkaḷam eṉpar*. The action, effect, form and colour listed in TP 276 are said to he *uvamait tōṟṟam* whereas superiority, beauty, affection and heroisum listed in TP 279 are four qualities of *nilaikkaḷaṉ*.

Tolkāppiyar states that comparison between the whole and the parts and the parts with parts (281). The common quality is not necessarily expressed and in such cases it is taken to be implied; accordingly two types of similes emerge viz., 1) A simile in which common quality is expressed. (*cuṭṭikkūṟiya uvamam*) as in *pavaḷam pōṟ centuvarvāy*. Here, the common quality namely redness (*centuvar*) is expressed. 2) A simile in which the common quality is not expressed but is implied (*cuṭṭikkuṟā uvamam*) as in *pavaḷavāy*. Here the common quality (redness) is not explicitly stated. However, the denotation can be understood from the word itself.

Tolkāppiyar stresses the necessity for appropriateness. (*aucitya*) in comparison (283). For instance, *mayiṟ ṟōkai pōlum kūntal* tresses resembling peacocks 'plume' is an appropriate comparison but *kākkai ciṟakaṉṉa karumayir* "heir as black as the wings of a crow" is inappropriate, apparently because it is not sanctioned by tradition.

Tolkāppiyar enumerates the comparative particles numbering 36. These thirty-six are further subdivided into four broad types under the heads of action, effect, form and colour.

Thirty six comparative particles are : 1) *aṉṉa*, 2) *ēyppa*, 3) *uṟaḷa*, 4) *oppa*, 5) *eṉṉa*, 6) *māṉa*, 7) *oṉṟa* 8) *oṭuṅka*, 9) *oṭṭa*, 10) *āṅka*, 11) *eṉṟa*, 12) *viyappa*, 13) *eḷḷa* 14) *viḻaiya* 15) *viṟappa*, 16) *nikarppa*, 17) *kaḷḷa* 18) *kaṭuppa*, 19) *kāyppa* 20) *matippa* 21) *takaiya* 22) *maruḷa* 23) *māṟṟa*,

24) *maruppa* 25) *pulla* 26) *poruva* 27) *poṟpa* 28) *pōla* 29) *vella* 30) *vīḻa* 31) *nāṭa*, 32) *naḷiya* 33) *naṭuṅka* 34) *nanta* 35) *ōṭa* and 36) *puraiya*.

1. viṉaiyuvamam	**2. payaṉ uvamam**
1. *aṉṉa*	1. *eḷḷa*
2. *āṅka*	2. *viḻaiya*
3. *māṉa*	3. *pulla*
4. *viṟappa*	4. *poruva*
5. *eṉṉa*	5. *kaḷḷa*
6. *uraḻa*	6. *matippa*
7. *takaiya*	7. *vella*
8. *nōkka*	8. *vīla*

3. meyyuvamam	**4. uruvuvamam**
1. *kaṭuppa*	1. *pōla*
2. *ēyppa*	2. *maruppa*
3. *maruḷa*	3. *oppa*
4. *puraiya*	4. *kāynta*
5. *oṭṭa*	5. *nēra*
6. *oṭunka*	6. *viyappa*
7. *ōṭa*	7. *naḷiya*
8. *nikarppa*	8. *nanta*

The particle *aṉṉa* can be used in all the four types (288). These four types can be multiplied by two, making them eight kinds (293). Thus each kind will be subdivided into two. For instance, it can either be expressed in a compound form (*tokai*) or its analysed form (*tokaiviri*). Thus *pulipāyttul* a compound which does not have a comparative particle, and *puliy aṉṉa pāyttuḷ* (analysed form) contains the comparative particle *aṉṉa* (like).

payavumai is further classified into two as good and bad.

Set I	Set II
1. *eḷḷa*	1. *viḷaiya*
2. *poruva*	2. *pulla*
3. *kaḷḷa*	3. *matippa*
4. *vella*	4. *vīḻa*

The set I can be used in contexts in which the *upamāna* is used in an inferior sense and the other set of words are used in the contexts in which neither object of comparison is inferior nor the object compared is superior.

meyyuvamam can be classified into two as doubt (*aiyapporuḷ*) and certainty (*tuṇivupporuḷ*)

I Doubt	II Certainty
1. *kaṭuppa*	1. *ēyppa*
2. *maruḷa*	2. *oṭṭa*
3. *puṟaiya*	3. *oṭuṅka*
4. *ōṭa*	4. *nikarppa*

uruvamam similarly is classified into two

I Set	II Set
1. *pōla*	1. *maruppa*
2. *oppa*	2. *kāyppa*
3. *nēra*	3. *viyappa*
4. *naḷiya*	4. *nanta.*

It appears that Tolkāppiyar views the aesthetic experience and usage of simile on the basis of superiority or inferiority in the sutras 294-298. They may appear in the following eight *meyppaṭus* or physical manifestation: *nakai, aḻukai, iḷivaraṉ, marutkai, accam, perumitam, vekuḷi* and *uvakai* (TP 251).

The following verse from Akam (16) poetry is an illustration for :

1. nakaiyuvamam

kaḷavuṭam: paṭutalir kaviḻntu nilaṅkiḷaiya.

The prostitute (*parattai*) who pretends as though she does not know or has not seen the hero rejoices at seeing his child (who resembles his father (ie. hero) while playing. Heroine, who hides herself behind the door, remarks 'you too is the child's mother'; Hearing these words of the heroine, the prostitute is shaken. Here the prostitute's state of mind is likened to that of the thief caught red handed. Heroine laugh at the condition of the prostitute.

2. avalavuvamam

kalaṅ kaviḻnta nāykaṉpōr kaḷaituṇaipiṟitiṉṟip-
pulampumeṉ ṉilai kaṇṭum pokalaṉī-yeṉṟyāl

(ya vi.pa.316)

The lamentation of lady love due to seperation from her lover is compared to the lamentation of mariner whose ship was wrecked.

3. iḷivaral uvamam

peruñcelvarillattu nalkūrntār pōla
varuñcellum tērum eṉ neñcu.

(Muttoḷ. 88)

Heroine's pitiable condition is compared to the unhappy situation of previously rich man, who was reduced to penury and who is in two minds to approach a wealthy person.

4. maruṭkai yuvamam

īrattuḷ iṉṉavai tōṉṟiṉ iḷarkayattu
nīruṭ kuvaḷai ventaṟṟu (Kali 41)

It is a wonder if the kuvaḷai which is in water gets burnt.

5. accavuvamai

cāntak attunṭeṉṟu ceppuṭ tiram tiran-toruvaṉ

pāmpakattuk kaṇṭatutaittu.

(Nalati. 126)

When a person opens a pot thinking that there is sandal inside the pot, finds to his horror a serpent inside.

6. perumitavuvamai

mallarai maṟañcāytta mālpōṟṟaṉ kiḷaināppaṭ

kalluyar naṉañ cāraṟ kalantiy-alu nāṭakēḷ

(Kali. 52)

Sense of pride experienced by the hero is compared to that of Viṣṇu who killed *mallars*.

7. vekuḷyuvamai

kūṟṟu vekuṇṭaṉṉa muṉpoṭu

māṟṟiru vēntar maṉṉōk kiḷaiye

(Puram. 42)

An enraged manarch who cast his eyes on the territory of enemies to conquer is likened to the anger of god of death.

8. uvakaiy uvamam

pāticeṉṟa paricilar pōla

vuviṉi vāḻi tōḻi

(Akam.65)

This is addressed by the lady love's companion. She tells her friend ie *talaivi* to be happy like the bards who is rewarded by the patron.

Types of uvamam

uvamam or *uvamai* is classified into two major types viz., *ullurai uvamam* or implicit simile and *ēnai uvamam* or explicit simile in the *Akattiņaiyiyal* (S 45). Tolkappiyar discusses both types of similies in the *Uvamaiyiyal*. He begins with different basis for forming simile, followed by enumeration of comparative particles and so on and so forth--- Tolkappiyar, discribes different kinds of similes in this section.

1. cuttikkūrā uvamai (S. 282)

The comparative particle is not explicity stated here. This is the opposite of normal type of *uvamai*.

2. poruḷē uvamam (S.283)

In this type of simile, *poruḷ* itself is considered as *uvamam*. According to Ilam. *upamāna* and *upameya* are not mentioned seperately in this simile. This corresponds to *rupaka* of Sanskrit rhetoricians. Peraciriyar interprets it as a kind of simile in which, both *upamāṉa* and *upameya* interchanges their places.

He illustrates this simile from a song from *Ciṟupāṇ* 72-73.

varumulaiyaṉṉa vaṇmukai yuṭaintu tirupuka mavilnta teyvattāmarai.

Here the beautiful face (*tirumukam*) and the breast (*mulai*) are described as *uvamai* and the bud (*mukai*) and the flower (*tāmarai*) are *porul*.

3. vērupaṭavanta uvamam

An *upamā* that is different from the others is known as *verupaṭavanta uvamai*. In the illustration cited by Ilam, three objects, viz. the sun, his rays and the darkness are found; of these the first two are respectively compared with the king and his way by the simile called rūpaka by the Sanskrit rhetoricians and the last one is left without identifying with another object. Thus, some object are identified and some others are not

in this kind of *upamā*. Peraciriyar, on the other hand, gives a number of *upamas* under this category. Majority of them correspond to the *upamas* explained in the *kāvyādarśa* of Dandin.

4. orīikkūrum uvamai *(S. 308)*

Instead of saying that this object is comparable to or like the other one, if it is said that it cannot he compared with that, that kind of simile is called *orīikkūṟum uvamai*. (Per.)

eg

mātar mukam pōl oḷiviṭa vallaiyēṟ

kātalai vāḻi mati.

(kuṟel 1118)

'O Moon, live long, if you can shine like these woman you will also deserve my love'.

ninnoraṉaiyai ni 'you are like you'.

5. payanilai purinta vaḻakkuvamai (S. 309)

Perāciriyar illustrates this kind of simile with a *Puṟam* song (107)

pāri pāri yeṉṟu palavētti yoruvar pukaḻvar cemāppulavar

Kapilar says that the poets praise the magnanimity of only Pāri. He implies that the unfailing rain (*māri*) also equally munificent. Here normal type of comparison between *uvamam* (rain) and *poruḷ* (Pari) is not used.

6. taṭumāru uvamam or uvamai

In this kind of simile, the *upamāna* is used as *upamāna* as well as the object (*poruḷ*) simultaneously. Naṟṟiṇai song. 35 : 2-5 can be cited as an illustration.

puṉkāl nāval....pūcal. (35 : 2-5)

A bee mistaking jamun (nāval palam) as its species swarms around it. A crab mistaking jamun as bee, tries to catch it. Here, first jamun is

mistaken for a bee and bee in turn is mistaken for a jamun fruit. It can be considered a mistaken identity not a regular comparison. That is why this type of comparison is named as *taṭumāṛu uvamai* or simile of delusion.

7. Aṭukkiya tōṟṟa uvamai

In this kind of simile one object is compared to another, that object is compared to some other. It is a chain of comparisons. Tolkāppiyar divides this simile into *niraniṟuttamaittal, niṟaniṟai and cuṇṇam*.

When a series of *upamāna* is compared to one *upameya*, it is called *niraṇ niṟutaimaittal*; when an equal number of *upameyas* is compared to equal number of *upamāna* in the same order it is called *nirannirai*. When an equal number of *upameyas* is compared to an equal number of *upamānas* in differnt order it is called *cuṇṇam*.

koṭikuvaḷai koṭṭai nucuppuṇkaṇ mēṉi
matipavaḷa mutta mukam vāy muṟuval
piṭipiṇai maññai naṭai nōkkuecāyal
vativiṉaḷe vañci makaḷ.

uvamappoli

Tolkappiyar speaks of *uvamappōli* in the sutras 299-300. Suhramanya sastri, translates the word *uvamappōli* as pseudo-simile. Perāciriyar takes this to be a suggested simile ie *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* or implicit simile and Ilampuranar thinks, it is the explicit simile and thus explains it consisting of five varieties. 1) There is no *upamanā* for it. 2) *poruḷ* itself is its *upamāna* 3) If all the lines of different objects are put together it can be compared to the object. 4) If all the beauties of other object are collected together then it can be considered comparable (*upamāna*) 5) When the *upameya* is compared to a disgraceful *upamāna*.

Tolkāppiyar says that it is of five kinds viz., action, result, shape, colour and origin.

1. viṉaiyuvamappōli (action)

Illustration cited for this *uvamappōli* is

karumpu naṭu pāttik kalitta tāmarai
curumpupaci kaḷaiyum perumpunatūra
putalvaṉ iṉṟavem muyankal-
atuve teyyaniṉ mārpucitaippatuve

(Ainkuru. 6th)

Lotus grown in the field meant for growing sugarcane serves to satisfy the hunger of bees. When, the heroine addresses the hero as belonging to the country in which such things occur, she implies that she lives in a house which is both to the wedded wife and the prostitute and observes the duties of house-wife. Here the implied sense is that the action of removing the hunger of bees is done by her in addition to the action of entertaining guests.

2. payavumappōli (result)

karaicēr vēḻaṅ karumpiṟ pūkkun
turaikēḻūraṉ koṭumai nāṇi
nallaṉeṉṟum yāme
yallaṉeṉṉumeṉ ṟaṭameṉṟōḷe

(Ain.kuru.12)

In this illustration, the heroine hints at the infidality of the hero without mentioning explicity the reason for such behaviour on the part of the hero. However, it is implied in the phrase *vēḻaṅ karumpu....... ūraṉ* which suggests that the heroine and the prostitute are treated in the same footing. This action of the hero is described by her as *koṭumai* or cruelty.

3. meyyuvamappōli (shape)

onrēnalle nonru ven kunrattup
porukaliru mititta neritāl vēṅkai
kuravar makalir kūntar peymmār
ninrukoyal malaru nātanotu
onrēn tōli yonrināne

(Kurun. 208).

Here in this song, the heroine compares ther present condition to the tree *vēṅkai* blossoming, despite being stampeded by elephants. The implied meaning is that just as the *veṅkai* tree blossoms she will also be united with her lover in future.

4. uruvumappōli (colour)

vannavontalai nutaṅka vāliyai
yonnutal arivai pannai pāyntenak.
kannaruṅ kuvalai nārit.
tannen ricine perun teraippunale

(Ainkuru. 73)

In this song, the heroine feels elated when the hero said that the water of the stream became cool after she had water sport with him.

5. pirappuvamappōli (origin)

poykaip pallai pulavu nāru nīrnāy
vālai nālirai perūu mūra
ennalantolaiv tāyinun
tunnalam perumpirart tōynta mārpē

(Ainkuru.63)

By addressing the hero, with the epithet saying that he belonged to the place in which the other (*nirnāy*) though born in a good spring or pond, used to return to the same river where he ate the *vālai* fish the

previous day, the heroine indirectly says that the hero, though coming of a noble family, he reflects only inferior quality. She implies that due to his contact with the prostitutes, (of lower birth) he also acquired the same inferior quality.

kūṟṟu or utterance

In the chapter on *uvamam*. Tolkappiyar includes *kūṟṟu* or utterance (discourse) in which similies are used, he specifies certain conditions in such utterances. If the lady love speaks, she should make use of only those objects (*karupporul*) which she is familiar with and if *kūṟṟu* is that of *tōli*, she can make use of all the object (*karupporul*) found in that region (301) *talaivi's* knowledge of the region is very limited as her movement is restricted whereas *toḻi* moves around wider area. For instance, the song from Kurun. 28 *oṉṟēṉ allēṉ talaivi* knows the *vēṅkai* tree which has been stampeded by the elephant, since she plucks flowers from that tree, as such it is known object for her. Hence she makes use of this object in her *kūṟṟu* in this poem.

taṉ pārpput tiṉṉum mutalaiyoṭu
veṇpūm poykait tavanūreṉpa, ataṉār
ṟañcol uṇarntōr mēṉi
poṉpōr ceyyum ūrkkiḻavōnē (Aiṅkura 41)

This song is attributed to *tōli*. Since she knows the cruel action of eating its own offspring she makes use of this action of crocodile her simile while referring to the action of *talaivaṉ*.

If the *kiḻavōṉ* (hero) uses *uvamappōli* it should be within the province of his knowledge (s.302). Since the hero is suppossed to have a wide experience of different regions, the poet's range of expressions which come through the mouth of the lover is wide. Tolkappiyar does not specify

particular object in others' *kūṟṟu*. Therefore we may take that they are free to use any object.

uvamappōli can be used to express both the sense of grief as well as joy (303)

Illust:

kaḷaṉi mā attu viḷaintukru tīmpaḻam
paḻaṉa vāḷai katūum ūraṉ. (Kuruñ.8)

This song is expressive of joy.

'That man from the village where carp in the pond snātch ripe mangoes as they fall from trees beside fields'.

It suggests a person obtaining all happiness without any exertion on his part.

tāycāppiṟakkum puḷḷik kaḷvaṉoṭu
piḷḷai tinnum mutalaittu (Ainkuru.24)

This song indirectly hints at the cruel action of hero by referring to the cruelty of a crocodile.

The ensuing three sutras (304-306) speak about the land or region which the characters can make use of, in the simile. The region, a lady love can make use of, is restricted to two. Peraciriyar takes it as *marutam* and *neytal*. There is no restriction on the usage of land if the speaker is *kiḻavōṉ*, *tōḻi* and *cevili* should make of *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* appropriate to the place and time.

uḷḷuṟai uvamam and iṟaicci

uḷḷuṟai uvamam (opposite to *eṉai uvamam*) and *iṟaicci* are used in denoting suggestion. There are divergent views that both are same or different. It is a vexed question and is yet to be solved.

Tolkappiyar speaks about *ullurai uvamam* in the sections. *Akat*, *Porul* and *Uvamai*. and iraicci in *Karpu* and *Porul*.

It is not the intention of the author to present various views expressed by different scholars. The present discussion on these two types of suggestion will be restricted to only how Tolkappiyar describes them. Tolkappiyar introduces topic of *ullurai* for the first time in the *Akat*. While speaking about *kūrru* or utterance at the stage of seperation of lovers. He mentions the kind of *ullurai uvamam* to be made use of by the speakers in such contexts.

a) ***ullurai uvamam* in *Akat***

1. *ullurai uvamam ēnai uvamam enat-tallātu ākum tinai unarvakaiyē.* (TP 46)
2. *ulluait teyvam olintatai nilam enakkollum enpa kuri arintōrē* (TP 4)
3. *ulluruttu itanotu ottupporul mutika ena ulluruttu iruvatai ullurai uvamam* (TP 48)
4. *ēnai uvmam tān unarvakaittē* (TP. 49).

b) ***ullurai* in *the Porul.***

1. *utanurai uvamam cuttu nakai cirappenak ketalaru marapin ullurai aintē.* (TP. 242)
2. *antamil cirappin ākkiya. inpam tanvayin varuntalum vakutta panbē* (T.P. 243)
3. *mankala moliyum vaiiya moliyum māril ānmaiyir colliya moliyun kūriyan marunkir kollum enpa* (T.P. 244)

c) ***ullurai in Uvamai.***

1. *uvamappōli aintu ena molipa* (T.P. 299)
2. *taval aruñ cirappin attanmai nātin vinaiyinum payattinum uruppinum uruppinum uruvinum pirappinum varūum tirattiyal enpa* (T.P.300)

3. *kiḻavi colliṉ avaḷaṟi kiḷavi tōlikkāyiṉ nilam peyarnturaiyātu* (T.P. 301)
4. *kiḻavōṟku āyiṉ ūranoṭu kiḻakkum ēṉōrkellām iṭam varaiviṉṟē* (T.P. 302)
7. *iṉitu uṟu kiḷaviyum tuṉiyuru kiḷaviyum uvama maruinkiṉ tōṉṟum eṉpa* (T.P. 303)
8. *kiḻavōtku uvamam īr iṭattu rittē*(T.P. 304)
9. *kiḻavōrku āyin iṭam varaivu iṉṟē* (T.P. 305)
10. *tōḻiyum ceviliyum poruntuvalinōkkik kūṟutaṟku uriyar koḷ vaḻiyaṉa* (T.P. 306)

Tolkappiyar's views on *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* can he deduced from the sutras cited alove. The following to be the basic functions of *uḷḷuṟai uvamam*.

1. *uḷḷuṟai* denotes an implied meaning in addition to the explicit sense.
2. *uḷḷuṟai* is restricted to only the *akam* poems.
3. *uḷḷuṟai* is of 5 kinds viz., (a) *uṭaṉuṟai*,(b) *uvamam* (c) *cuṭṭu*, (d) *nakai* and (e) *ciṟappu*
4. The basis for *uvamai* or explicit simile is said to be four, i.e. *viṉai*, *payaṉ*, *mey* and *uru*, whereas the basis for *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* is said to he five.
5. Both *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* and *ēṉai uvamam* are based on the *karupporuḷ* of *akam* theme. Exceptung *teyvam* or god all the rest can be made use of in *uḷḷuṟai* where as in *uvamam*. all objects listed as *karupporuḷ* can be used.
6. *uḷḷuṟai* enables the reader to identify the *tiṇai* of the poem.
7. *uḷḷurai* occurs in the form of *kūṟṟu*.

5 types of *uḷḷuṟai* listed in *Poruḷ*

a) ***uṭaṉuṟai*** or implied meaning conveyed indirectly by means of a specific reference to a distinictive feature of any tract of land.

Ilust.

viḷaiyy āttāyamoṭu veṇmaṇal aḻuttu
marantaṉam turanta kālmulaiya kaiya
ney peytīmpāl peytiṉitu vaḷarppu.
numminuñ ciṟantatu nuvvai yatrum eṉṟu
aṉṉai kūṟiṉal puṉṉaiyoṭu cirappē
umma nāṇutum nummoṭu nakaiyē.

(Naṟ. 172)

In the poem from the phrase *puṉṉaikku nāṉutum* we infer that it was the *puṉṉai* that she tendered and also that her mother may frequent the place very often. So saying she advises hero to keep away and try to win her hand in public wedding.

b) ***uvamam*** **or simile**

veṟikol iṉaccurumpu mēyntatōr
kāvik kuṟaipaṭun tēṉ veṭṭum
kurukum-niṟai matucērntu
uṇṭatum taṉ mukattē - uṭaiyatōr
vaṇṭāmaraip pirinta vaṇṭu (Taṇṭi 53. urai)

Here, the lady love, referring to the action of a bee, indirectly tells the hero's separation resulting due to his visit to prastitute.

c) ***cuṭṭu*** is that in virtue of which when once a certain meaning is intended, another meaning allied to it is derived.

Ilust.

toṭi nōkki meṉ tōḷum nokki aṭinōkki
ahtāṇṭavaḷ ceytatu (Kural. 1279)

She looked at her bracelets, her tender shoulders and her feet; this is what she did there.'

The friend informs the hero, of heroine's intention in this By these actions, she indirectly conveys her willingness to elope with him. Otherwise, (i.e. if she remains separated from her lover) she will be emaciated and her bracelet etc. will not remain in its place.

d) *nakai.* - a smile or laugh gives out a meaning different fom what she actually expresses, it is known as *nakai*.

Illus.

acaiyiyar kuṇṭāṇṭōrē eryāṉ
pacaiyiṉaḷ paiya nakum

(Kuraḷ 1078)

When a look, the pitying maid looks in return and smiles gently.

These words are the words of the hero. As she smiles gently when I looked at her, I infer there is an idea underlying this smile i.e. her consent.

e) *ciṟappu* - If we are able to make out a secondary meaning when one says that one is better than other, then we term it *ciṟappu*.

Illust.

āmpar puviṉ cāmpar aṉṉa
kūmppiya ciṟakar manaiyurai Rurīi
muṉṟil uṇaṅkal manti maṉrattu
eruviṉ nuṇtatu kuṭaivaṉa āṭi
illiṟaip paḷḷit tam pillaiyoṭu vatiyum
puṉkaṇ mālaiyum pulampum
iṉṟukol tōḷiyavar ceṉṟa nāṭē

(Kurun. 46)

In the land where he has gone.
my friend.

are there no sad evenings,
when sparrows with wings that fold,
like petals of a fading lily
eat grain in the court yard
and play
as they scoop out bits of dust
from dung in public places,
and live with their young
in the eaves of the house
Is there no loneliness.
where he lives?

This is said by the heroine to her friend. She tells her friend that she was affected by loneliness and evening, due to separation from her lover also would equally suffer due to separation in the evening. Therefore he would also return to her without further delay. Thus, she consoles herself with this hope.

Meaning denoted here is that the hero who led a happy life in the house had gone to ekl out wealth. He would definitly return home and live happily with his son, just as the sparrows who return to their nest in the evening. Though it appears to be *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* idea of the poet is to speak of the superiority of the evening. Hence it is said *ciṟappu uḷḷuṟai*.

What is iṟaicci ?

iṟaicci mostly refers to the objects such as deer; goat. cattle etc., i.e. the animals and birds, the sentient beings found in a particular region. i.e. *karupporuḷ* Therfore, *iṟaicci* may be considered as denoting *karupporuḷ*. We may note that the word *iraicci* is used to the meat of goat etc. even today.

Let us first cite the *nūrpas* from *Tolkāppiyam* where in, the author speaks about this and then deduce his views on *iṟaicci*

a) iraicci* in *Poruḷ

1. *iṟaicci tāṉē potuṭ puṟattatuvē* (T.P. 229)
2. *iṟaicciyiṟ pirakkum porulum āruḷavē*
   tirattiyaṉ maruṅkil teriyumōrkkē (T.P.230)
3. *aṉpuṟu takuvaṉa iṟaicciyuṭ cuṭṭalum*
   vaṉpuṟaiy ākum varuntiya poḻutē (TP 231)

b) *iraicci* in *Karpu.*

puṇarntuṭaṉ pōkiya kilavōḷ maṉaiyirun
tiṭaiccurat tiṟaicciyum viṉaiyuñ cuṭṭi
anpuru takka kiḷattal tāṉē
kiḷavōṉ ceyviṉaik kaccamākum.

(TP 148)

c) *iṟaicci* in *Collatikāram*

iraiccipporuḷ vayiṉ ceyyuḷil kiḷakkum
iyarpeyarkkiḷavi uyartiṇaic cuṭṭā
nilattuvaḷi marūnkiṉ toṉralāṉa

(TC 190).

This sutra says that the names of animals, birds and trees used as *karupporuḷ* in the *akam* poems, do not denote *uyartiṇal* even when they are used with *uyartiṇal-* denoting suffixes as they are called so on the basis of land.

Now, *iraicci* as discribed by Tdkāppiyar may be summed up, as :

1. *iṟaicci* normally refers to *karupporuḷ* ie. the sentient beings of the listed objects of *karuppruḷ*.

2. The life activities of these sentient beings are depicted in the poems dealing with *aintiṇai*. As the activities of these animals and birds are depicted as that of *uripporuḷ*, they are actually outside the area of *uri*.
3. Description of the activities of animals may or may not indicate suggested sense to the ordinary reader. However, the suggested sense will be clearly understood by those who have sharp intellect.
4. Affectionate feeling will certainly he generated in the mind of the hero, when he observes affectionate feelings of the animal kingdom, on his way. Thereby, he will hasten his return.

Illust

ilaṅku maruvitt ilaṅkum aruvittē
vāṉilaṅkum aruvittē tāṉuṟṟa
cūḷpeṇāṉ poyttāṉ malai (Kali 41)

Full of glittering streams, full of glittering streams, streams formed by the showers, the hill which is owned by the hero who has behaved falsely by not fulfulling his vow.

Here the direct meaning is that the hero who has behaved falsely by not fulfilling his vow. But, outside it we have the following inference. 'How is it' that such a hill owened by him is full of perennial stream.

kaṉṟu taṉ payamulai mānta muṉṟil
tiṉai piṭiy uṇṇum peruṅkal nāṭa
keṭṭiṭat tuvanta utavi kaṭṭil
vīṟupeṟṟu maṟanta maṉṉaṉ pōla
naṉṟi maṟantamaiyayāyiṉ meṉcīrk
kali mayiṟ kalāyat taṉṉavivaḷ
olimeṉ kūntal uriyavām niṉakkē (Kuruṅ, 225).

These are the words of the maid addressed to the hero who was bent upon parting from the heroine in quest of wealth, keeping the open wedding in abeyanee. This song is an illustration for *Tolkappiyam* sutra 230 cited above.

Dear hero, please accept the lady in open wedding in deference to our wish, without forgetting the benevolent acts by us. Oh Lord of the place full of lofty hills where she elephant freely grazes on the millet form situated in the front of the house, while the young cubs suckle its milk laden udder.

If you will only wed my lady in open wedding without assuming the role of an ungrateful person by forgetting what little acts of kindness we might have done to you, like the king who on getting the kingship, forgets the timely help rendered to him by others, while he was in a state of penury, the fertile or well grown tresses of this lady which look like the spread up feathers of a buoyant peacock are yours for enjoyment.

The inner meaning is as follows : Just as the she elephant grazed on the millet so that it can secure enough milk to feed its calf on it it is your duty to earn enough wealth and at the same time weded her in public.

Here the whole phrase containing implict simile (*uḷḷuṟai uvamam*) governs the word *nāṭa* (hero, of the place....) which shows that it is *iṟaicci* not *ullurai uvaman* in this song.

Ilampūraṇam has the variant reading which reads *iraiccitāṉe urippur attatuvē*

According to him, *iraicci* denotes *karupporul* : *iraiccipporuḷ eṉpatu uripporuḷiṉ puratte tōṉṟum poruḷ eṉṟavāṟu āḥtāvatu karupporuḷāy nāṭṭirkum ūrkkum turaikkum aṭaiyāki varuvatu* ie. it will occur as an adjunct to or the qualifying word for the town, village or the particular division or section. He illustrates it with a song from *Kuruṅtokai*

nilattiṉum peritē vāṉiṉum uyarntaṉṟu
nīriṉum āraḷaviṉṟe cāraṟ
karuṅkōr kuriñcippūkkoṇṭu
peruntēṉ iḻaikkum nāṭaṉoṭu naṭpē. (Kuruṅ 3)

Bigger than the earth, certainly higher than the sky
more unfathomable than the waters is this love for this man
of the mountain slopes where the bees make rich honey from
the flowers of the *kuriñci* that has such black stalks.

Here the *kuriñci* flower and the honey that have come as the qualifying epithets of the hero's country or nāṭu are the iṟaiccipporuḷ.

Nacciṉārkkiniyar is of the opinion that *iṟaicci* mostly reflects the cruelty on the part of the hero. The illustration given above can also imply this idea with the word, *karunkōr kuriñci ppūkkoṇṭu peruntēṉ iḻaikkum nāṭaṉ*. This song is attributed to *talaivi*. She expresses her sense of sorrow over the cruel action of the hero for not expediting the open wedding.

S.231.(*aṉpuṟu takuvaṉa* .....) tells us that *iraicci* can appear in some other forms also when *talaivi* suffers from the seperation of her lover *tōḻi* compels (*vaṉpuṟu*) her to be patient, assuring her his immediate return by referring to his favourite object (flora and fauna)

nacai perituṭaiyar nalkalu nalkuvar
piṭipaci kaḷaiya peruṅkai veḻa
meṉciṉai yāam polikkum
aṉpiṉa tōliyavar eṉṟavārē (Kuruṅ.37)

Oh my dear friend! My hero is full of affection for you; he may bestow his affection and grace on you. For, in the path he is now frequenting, he will surely witness the male-elephant with the long trunk, peeling of the branches, of the *yān* or *ācca* in order to appease the hunger of its mate.

The lover who was already full of affection for her, is likely to witness in the wood a scene in which the male elephant, in order to remove the terrible hunger of its mate, breaking the Āccā tree and feeding it with the fibres of the Āccā tree. The maid, in order to reassure the lady love, tells her that her lover was not naturally indifferent to her. By witnessing such affection in animals, his natural affection will enhance his hove for her and hasten his return.

Apart from the subject matter of *karupporuḷ* which is explicity spoken of, implicity stated matters pertaining to *uripporul* also finds a place here. This *kuṟippupporuḷ* is formed in such a way as to reflect the speaker's happiness or sorrow as the case may be.

Here, *uvamai* and *poruḷ* are used in a manner that they are the same. But the implied sense will be clear only to the speaker and the addressee.

iṟaicci and uḷḷurai

Though the question of *iṟaicci* and *uḷḷurāi* being different or the same is still unresolved, some scholars attempt to distinguish them. Naccinarkkinyar for instance, thinks that one of the five types of *uḷḷṟai*, is *iraicci*.

Both *uḷḷuṟai*, and *iṟaicci* are being made use of by the *akam* poets in suggestion *uḷḷuṟai*, and *iṟaicci* as suggestion is one of the devices introduced by the *akam* poets.

Meypāṭṭiyal

The *Meypāṭṭiyal* forms the sixth section of TP. As the topic dealt with in this section, is *meyppāṭu*, this section is called *Meypāṭṭiyal*.

Tamil lexicon records the word *meyppāṭu* with the meaning manifest physical expression. The word *meyppāṭu* is a compound consisting of

mey and *patu* as its constituents. *mey* means body (*uṭal*) and *paṭu* means to manifest. The whole compound means the feeling or sentiment manifesting in the physique. The word *meyppāṯu* is defined by Tolkappiyer as follows. If the description of an object is so vivid that one can enjoy it with hair bristling, eyes shedding tears etc. it is called *meypātu* (sastri).

> *uyttuṇarviṉṟit talaivaru poruḷāṉ*
> *meyppaṭa mutippatu meyppātākum*

(TP 516, *Ceyyuḷ* 207).

The commentators use the term *cuvai* (taste corresponding to Sanskrit *rasa* for *meypāṭu* though Tolkāppiyar himself has not used this term anywhere in this section.

Tolkāppiyar's opening *nūrpa* of this section says that thirty two things appear in literature may be reduced to sixteen (245). He does not explain what these thirty two things are and how they can be reduced to sixteen. He does not say what is the need to reduce the thirty two into sixteen either. In the next sutra (246) he says that the sixteen can further be reduced to eight. Here also there is no explanation for further reduction. However, the commentators Ilam and Peraciriyar explain it as the eight are the eight emotions beginning with *nakai* listed in the sutra 251. The four referred to here are explained as *cuvaipporuḷ* or the object looked at, *poriyuṇarvu* or sense perception is the act of seeing, *maṉakkuṟippu* is the feeling emerging out of *poriyuṇarvu* and *viṟal* is the modification of the physique resulting from *maṉakkuṟippu*. Thus, the eight emotions multiplied by these four, comes to thirty two. This can be explained as under: when a man happens to meet a girl in a proper atmosphere for the first time, they look at each other as a result of which they experience a peculiar feeling in their mind. These new and sudden feelings cause some changes in their bodies as well.

Now let us see how thirty two can he reduced to sixteen and eight. As long as the hero and the heroine remain without seeing, there is no

possibility of sense perception. Therefore the two viz. *cuvaipporuḷ* and *poriyuṇarvu* may be taken as one. Similarly when there is mental perception, there is no scope for external physical manifestation. Thus, *manakkuṟippu* and *viṟal* may be taken as one principle. This is how the thirty two are reduced to sixteen.

Although, the four *cuvaipporuḷ* and the rest are important individually in relation to the eight *meyppāṭus*, finally all these principles are subservient to the major eight physical manifistation. Thus the number eight is arrived.

Eight m*eyppāṭu* listed in the sutra 251 of TP are as follows :-

1. *nakai* or laughter;	[*hāsya* (Skt.)]
2. *aḻukai* or sorrow;	[*karuṇa*(Skt.)]
3. *iḷivaral* or disgust;	[*bībhatsa* (Skt.)]
4. *maruṭkai* or surprise;	[*adbhuta* (Skt.)]
5. *accam* or terror;	[*bhayānaka*(Skt.)]
6. *perumitam* or bravery;	[*vīra* (Skt.)]
7. *vekuḷi* or anger;	[*raudra*(Skt.)]
8. *uvakai* or love;	[*śṛṅgāra*(Skt.)]

It may be noted that *śānta* or tranquility does not find a place either in Tolkāppiyar's list or in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata.

It is very difficult to say whether Tolkāppiyar's list of *meyppāṭu* corresponds to the *rasa* or sentiment or *sthāyibhāva* or permanent emotion of Bharata. Tolkāppiyar's list differs from the order in which it is listed in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. His sutra does not indicate the reason why he places the *meyppāṭus* in this order. Peraciriyar the commentator however, has his own reasons for this order and explains it accordingly in his commentary on the said sutra.

It is surprising to note that *perumitam* or bravery is placed in the sixth position in his list of *meyppātu* and love (*uvakai*) the last place when we look at the back drop of his rules on the literary theme in the preceding *iyalṣ*. Moreover, early Tamil poets are noted for their depiction of love (*akam*) and heroism or bravery (*perumitum*).

Ist set of meyppāṭus

The casue for the rise of these eight *meyppāṭus* are explained in the sutra (251). Each one of these *meyppāṭus* are said to have four causes or reasons. Thus, *nakai* is caused by 1) *eḷḷal* or mockery 2) *iḷamai* or childishness 3) *pētamai* or childishness and 4) *maṭam* or credulity.

Aḻukai has its source in 1) *iḻivu* or contemptible treatment, 2) *iḻavu* or loss of property or life, 3) *acaivu* or change for the worse and 4) *varumai* or poverty.

Iḷivaral is the result of 1) *mūppu* or old age, 2) *piṇi* or disease, 3) *varuttam* or pain and 4) *meṉ mai* or low status.

Maruṭkai results from 1) *putumai* or newness 2) *perumai* or greatness, 3) *ciṟumai* or littleness and 4) *ākkam* or transformation.

Accam originate from 1) *aṇaṅku* or evil spirit, 2) *vilaṅku* or animal, 3) *kaḷvar* or thives and 4) *tamiṟai* or respectable persons.

perumitam is caused by 1) *kalvi* or scholarship, 2) *tarukaṉ* or bravery, 3) *icaimai* or fame and 4) *koṭai* or literacy.

vekuḷi has the source in 1) *uruppaṟai* or extremely painful cutting of the limbs, 2) *kuṭikōl* or distinction of family, 3) *alai* or plunder and 4) *kolai* or murder.

The last one *uvakai* is generated by 1) *celvam* or wealth, 2) *pulaṉ* or sense objects i.e. enjoyment of pleasure, 3) *puṇarvu* or sexual union and 4) *viḷaiyāṭṭu* or sports.

After enumerating principal *meyppāṭus* and their subdivisions, Tolkāppiyar enumerates a list of another set of thirty two *meyppatus* (s.260). They are as follows :-

IInd set of meyppāṭus

1. *uṭaimai* or the feeling of ownership, 2. *iṉpural* or the feeling of satisfaction, 3. *naṭuvanilai* or the state of equipoise, 4. *arulal* or the act of grace, 5. *taṉmai* or remaining in one's own nature, 6. *aṭakkam* or modesty, 7. *varaiṭal* or right conduct, 8. *aṉpu* or affection, 9. *kaimmikal* or exceeding the limit, 10. *nalital* or tormenting others, 11. *cūḻcci* or pondering, conspiracy, 12. *vāllttal* or wishing well, 13. *nāṇutal* or feeling shy, 14. *tuñcal* or sleep, 15. *aṟaṟṟutal* or blabbering, 16. *kaṉavu* or dream, 17. *muṉital* or feeling disgusted, 18. *niṉaittal* or remembering the past, 19. *verūutal* or slight anger, 20. *maṭīmai* or sluggishness, 21. *karutal* or thinking, 22. *āraycci* or deliberation, 23. *viraivu* or haste, 24. *uyirppu* or sighing, 25. *kaiyāṟu* or sense of disappointment, 26. *iṭūkkaṇ* or suffering, 27. *poccāppu* or inconstancy, 28. *poṟāmai* or jealousy, 29. *viyarttal* or perspiring, 30. *aiyam* or indecisive nature and 31. *mikai* or audacity, 32. *naṭukkam* or tremor.

After enumerating these two sets of *meyppāṭus*, Tolkappiyar speaks about *meyppāṭus* specific to *kaḷavu*, common to both *kaḷavu* and *kaṟpu* and so on.

He gives a list of 24 *meyppāṭus* specific to only *kaḷavu*. These are listed appearing in six stages, four *meyppāṭus* each.

meyppāṭus specific to *kaḷavu*.

Ist stage:

1. *putumukam pukutal* or the meeting the look of the lover.
2. *porinutal viyarttal* or perspiring in the forehead.
3. *nakunayamaṟaittal* or controlling the laugh.
4. *citaivu piṟarkkiṉmai* or not exposing her weakness.

II stage :

5. *kuḻai virittal* or loosening the hair.
6. *kātonṟu kaḷaital* or 'setting right the ear ornament.
7. *ūḻaṇi taivaral* or moving the ornaments here and there.
8. *uṭaipeyarttuṭuttal* or loosening and tightening the dress.

III stage :

9. *alkul taivaral* or touching her secret part.
10. *aṇintavai tiruttal* or bringing the ornaments to their original position.
11. *ilvaliyuṟuttal* or pretending to be strong.
12. *irukaiyum eṭuttal* or raising both the hands.

IV stage :

13. *pārāṭṭeṭuttal* or speaking in appreciative terms.
14. *maṭantapavuraittal* or speaking beyond area of credulity.
15. *īramil kūrram ēṟṟa var nāṇal* or feeling shy for the public scandal
16. *kaṭuppavai keṭal* or receiving whatever is given by the hero.

V ***th*** ***stage :***

17. *terintu uṭampaṭutal* or giving her consent after deliberations.
18. *tiḷainppu viṉai maruttal* or refusing to enjoy the company of hero as before.
19. *karantiṭattoḷital* or choosing solitude
20. *kaṇtavaḷiyuvattal* or felling happy on seeing her lover.

VI ***th*** ***stage :***

21. *purañceya citaittal* or not enjoying the ornamentation or beautification.

22. *pulampittonṟal* or appearing dejected.
23. *kalaṅkimoḻital* or speaking with a disturbed mind
24. *kaiyaṟa vuraittal* or sheaking in utter disappointment.

All these 24 *meyppātus* appearing in 6 stages are said to take place only with reference to lady-love.

After enumerating these twenty four *meyppātus* relating to *kaḷavu* stage, Tolkāppiyar gives another list of twenty *meyppātus* apperaing commonly in both *kaḷavu* and *kaṟpu* stage. They are as follows :-

1. *iṉpattai veruttal* or averse ness to pleasure.
2. *tuṉpattup pulampal* or lamenting in sorrow
3. *etirpeytu purital* or expressing one's grief visualizing the object of love.
4. *ētamāytal* or consideration of the impediment
5. *paciyaṭaniṟṟal* or fasting'
6. *pacalai pāytal* or spreading of beauty spots on the skin
7. *uṇtiyiṟ kuṟaital* or consumming small quantity of food.
8. *uṭampu nali curunkal* or emaciation of the body
9. *kaṇṭuyiṉ mayankal* or sleeplessness
10. *kaḷavoṭu mayaṅkal* or perplexity in dream
11. *poyyākkōṭal* or doubting the verocity of the words of the object of love
12. *meyyeyeṉṟal* or coming to the conclusion that the words are true
13. *aiyeñceytal* or doubting his meeting
14. *avaṉ ṟamar uvattal* or feeling happy at the sight of his relatives.
15. *aṟaṉ aḻitturaittal* or finding fault with the the god of Dharma.
16. *āṅku neñcaḻital* or piteous expression of one's feelings.

17. *emmeyyāyiṉum oppumai kōṭal* or finding the point of comparison between any object and the hero (*talaivaṉ*).
18. *oppuvaḻiyuvattal* or feeling happy there is a point of comparison.
19. *urupeyar kēṭṭal* or feeling happy hearing the hero's (*talaivaṉ*) great fame.
20. *kalakkam* or confusion.

Then follows a list of eight *meyppāḻūs* which is said to have scope for *kaṟpu* stage. (s.271)

1. *muṭṭuvayiṟ kaḻartal* or cursing when there is obstacle in meeting hero.
2. *muṉivu meynniṟuttal* or controlling anger.
3. *accattiṉ akaṟal* or evading on account of fear.
4. *avaṉ puṇarvu maruttal* or avoiding meeting him.
5. *tūtū muṉiviṉmai* or not getting angry with the messengers.
6. *tuñcicērtal* or pretending to be asleep.
7. *kātal kaimmikal* or being overpowered with passion.
8. *kaṭṭuraiy iṉ mai* or keeping silent.

The following eleven *meyppāṭus* are said to happen after the union ie. they belong to *kaṟpu* stage.

1. *teyvam añcal* or fearing god.
2. *puraiyaṟan teḻital* or discrning the correct dharma.
3. *illatu kāytal* or feeling angry towards the lover imagining some fault in him.
4. *uḷḷatūvarttal* or not having disposed to accept the favour shown by the lover sincerely.
5. *puṇartuḻiyuṇmai* or telling the truth at the time of union.
6. *poḻutu maṟuppākkam* or rejecting the unsuitable time.

7. *aruṇmikavuṭaimai* or being in ecstacy on account of ease of mind.
8. *aṉputokaniṟṟal* or openly showing the height of her love.
9. *pirivāṟṟāmai* or not being able to hear the pangs of seperation.
10. *maṟaintavaiy uraittal* or narrating incidents happened at *kaḷavu* stage.
11. *purañ coṉ mānākkilavi* or saving her husband from public scandal.

In TP 93 (*Kalavu* 2), the author states that the *talaivaṉ* and *talaivi* should be of equal status. In the sutra 273 (Meyppātu 25) he specifies these qualities. He enumerates them as

1. *piṟappu* or of equal birth, 2. *kuṭimai* or behaviour, 3. *āṇmai* or manliness, 4. *āṇṭu* or age, 5. *uruvu niṟutta kāma vāyil* or suitability in physique, 5. *niṟai* or non-betrayal of one's secrets, 6. *aruḷ* or compassionate nature, 7. *uṇarvu* or possessing intelligence, 8. *tiru* or wealth.

In the next sutra (274), Tolkappiyar lists the qualities which are not suitable for the love affair between hero and the heroine. They are 1. *nimpiri* or jealousy, 2. *koṭumai* or cruelty, 3. *viyappu* or wondering (at the qualities of divine nature in *talaivi*) 4. *puṟamoḻi* or back biting, slander 5. *vaṉcol* or harsh word, 6. *poccāppu* or wichedness, instability, 7. *maṭimai* or laziness, 8. *kuṭimai* or considering himself superior in comparison to his lady love, 9. *iṉpuṟal* or pleasure, gratification, 10. ēḻaimai or ignorance. 11. *maṟappu* or refusal, denial, opposition, 12. *oppumai* or lowering his lady love comparing her with somebody else.

Tolkāppiyar concludes this section with the sutra *kaṇṇinuñ ceviyiyiṉum....kuraitte* (s.275) ie. the *meyppātūs* of fine quality cannot be understood by those other than they who have correct perspective of things through correct observation and hearing.

□□

III. Sanskrit Alaṁkāra Texts

Sanskrit claims the distinction of having a long and glorious literary heritage. Even the *Rgveda*, the earliest of all the extant literary compositions of the world had a good amount of poetic element and even now has a good degree of poetic appeal. (Kane: 1951). This long literary heritage resulted in a standard literary taste and consequently there was a very large number works on poetics. These works had, the already existing *kāvyas* and presented a theoretical discussion on the fundamentals of *kāvya*. The word *kāvya* has a much broader cannotation than the English word 'poetry'. The word *kāvya* in Sanskrit includes all the literary compositions wheather written in verses or prose fictions or in a mixed form of verses and prose (K.D.I. 11). In English, the term literature is often used to mean technical literature also and the term poetry is used in a much restricted sense, to denote only the literary composition in verse.

Development of poetics in Sanskrit

The Sanskrit name for criticism is *sāhitya* or *alamkāra* sastra. The word *sāhitya* (from *sahita* meaning together) togetherness emphasises the indissoluble unity of form and content. Kalidasa, refers to this unity and compares it to the inseperable nature of the divine couple Parvati and Paramesvara in the opening verse of his well known Mahakāvya, *Raghuvamsà*. The term *alaṁkāra* or embellishment indicates the subject of enquiry. This term is popularly used for the science.

Beginnings

It is claimed that the poetics had its origin in the grammatical works.

upamā

Comparative particles relating the Vedic *upamā* are listed in the *Nighaṇṭu* III 13. They are of twelve varieties which are illustrated in the Nirukta I 4; III 13-18; and IX 6 Yāska discusses six of these particles viz. *iva*, *yathā*, *na*, *cit*, *nu* and *ā* in connection with the treatment of comparative particles. (*upamārthe nipātas*) in I 4. and they are partly included in what he calls *karmopamā* in III 5. Then *yāska* mentions *bhūtopamā* in which the *upamita* becomes the *upamāna* in character and *rupopamā* where *upamita* resembles the *upamāna* in form. The fourth variety occurs where the particle *yathā* is used. Then comes *siddhopamā* in which the standard of comparison is well established and known to surpass every other object in a particular quality or act and is characterised by the suffix-*vat*. The last variety is *luptopamā* or suppressed simile also called *arthopamā* equivalint to the *rūpakas* of the later theorists eg. the words *simha* and *vyāghra* in a laudatory and *śvan* and *kāka* in a derogatory sense. The term *upamāna* itself is used by Yāska but only to denote these particles of comparison. The significance of comparison in general is also referred to in I. 19; II. 6; III. 55; IV. ii; V. 22 and VII. 13. Incidentally Yāska quotes the grammarian Gargya's definition of *upamā*. As explained by Durgācārya, it lays down that *upamā* occurs when an object which is dissimilar is reckoned through similarity with an object having similar attributes. It also states as a general rule that the standard of comparison should be superior in merit and better known than the object of comparison, but the reverse case is also admitted and illustrated (III. 14-15) by two examples from the *Rgveda* (X 4, 6; 40, 2). The definition undoubtely establishes a very early but more or less definite conception of the poetic *upamā*.

By the time of Panini the concept of *upamā* scems to have been tacitly recognized and we find him using in this connection the technical terms *upamāna*, *upamita* and *sāmānya* as well as general expressions like *upamā* used in the sense of the rhetoricians *upamāna*. It is worth noting that in nearly 50 sutras distributed all over his work, Panini, discusses *upamāna* from the grammarianś point of view.

In the *Mahābhāsya* on P2. 1. 55, Patañjali has defined and illustrated Panini's use of the term *upamāna*. *māna* or measure is that which is employed in ascertaining a thing unknown *upamāna* is approximate to *māna* determines the thing not absolutely but approximately. The word *gavaya* 'is like a cow' is cited as illustration. Strictly speaking a rhetorician will not accept the example addueed by Patañjali as an instance of poetic *upamā* in as much as the characteristic charm essential in a poetic figure is wanting in such a plain expression. But this grammatical analysis of the general idea of comparison is an early and near approach to the technical concept of poetics.

It should be admitted that those speculations of grammarians are not definite enough to indicate the existance of a system.

Ānandavardhana, speaks of his own theory based on the authority of the grammarians to whom he pays rich tribute as the first and foremost thinkers (*prathame hi vidvāṁśca vaiyākaraṇāḥ vyākaraṇa mūlatvāt ṣarvavidyānām*)

Ānandavardhana's *dhvani* theory is based on the *sphoṭa* theory of the grammarians which he himself admits.

Bhāmaha, one of the earliest known formulators of poetic theory proclaims openly in V. 63, the truimph of Panini's views.

It is clear from internal evidence as well as from the testimony of some of the authorities on poetics, that the theorotical backgound of the discipline was to some extent founded on the philosophical speculations

of language so that grammer, one of the oldest and soundest science of India was its god father and helped towards reaching acceptance (De. 1923). Though some of the poetic theories can be said to have been based on early grammatical speculations, poetics as a technical science is said to have a comparatively late origin, probably in the first few centuries of Christian era. *Alaṁkāra śāstra* emerged as a seperate technical discipline from about the commencement of Christian era.

Bharata

Bharata is said to be the author of *Nātyasastra*, a work on Dramaturgy. He was the first exponent of *rasa* theory. He has been assigned a date varying from the 2nd century B.C. to the 2nd century A.D.: Bharata's *Nāṭya śāstra* will be taken up for discussion in connection with the *rasa* theory later.

The older school of poetics is represented by three rhetoricians, viz. Bhāmaha, Dandin, and Vāmana. (see alamkara theory for further details)

Bhāmaha

Bhāmaha wrote *Kāvyālaṁkāra* or *Bhāmahālaṁkāra*. He can be placed approximately in the period between the last quarter of the 7th and the middle of the 8thd century A.D.

Dandin

Dandin is believed to have lived in the South. He probably lived in the 7th A.D. Dandin himself a poet, wrote his *kāvyādarsa* or mirror of poetry.

Udbhaṭa

Udbhaṭa, who wrote a commentary named *Bhāmahavivaraṇa*, has also authored the work called *kāvyālaṁkāra saṇgraha*. He must have lived certainly before the exposition of *dhvani* theory of Ānandavardhana who lived in the middle of 9th century A.D.

Vāmana

Vāmana wrote *kāvyālamkāra vṛtti* and probably lived between the middle of the 8th century and the middle of the 9th century at about 800 A.D. He was the proponent of *rīti*.

Rudraka

Rudraka the author of *kāvyālamkāra* is supposed to have lived in about the middle of the 9th century. A.D.

Viṣṇudharmottara purāṇa

Viṣṇudharmottara purāṇa contain some sections on *Alaṁkāra* and dramaturgy.

Agnipurāṇa

The *Agnipurāṇa* which deals with poetics in capters 336-346 includes chapters 337-341, devoted to the drama exclusively approaching Bhāratiya Nāṭyaśāstrā scheme literally where as Bharata speaks of only 10 types of drama, 27 varieties of drama are enumerated in the *Agnipurāṇa*.

Alaṁkāra or poetic embellishments are divided into embellishments of the sound or *śabdālaṁkāra* and embellishment of the meaning or *arthālaṁkāra* a division yet unknown to Bharata.

Ānandavardhana

Ānandavardhana is the author of the celebrated work *Dhvanyāloka* also called *kāvyalamkāra* or *sahṛdayāloka*. He has been assigned to about 800 A.D.

Kuntaka

The concept of deviation in the Indian poetics is popularised by Kuntaka in his masterly treatise entitled *vakroktijivitam*. Though the concept existed even before, the distinction of formulating it into a system of literary criticism goes to Kuntaka. Kuntaka elevated *vakrokti* to greater heights calling it 'the life of poetry'.

Rājaśekhara

Rājasekhara, who is said to have lived during 880-920 A.D. wrote *kāvyamīmaṁśā*

Abhinavagupta

Abhinavagupta wrote *Dhvanyālokalocanā* a great commentary on the *Dhvanyāloka*. He is placed towards the close of the 10th century and beginning of the 11th century A.D.

Mahimabhaṭṭa

Mahimabhaṭṭa, the author of *Vyaktiviveka* lived in the beginning of 11th century A.D. Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka were severely criticised in this work.

Rudraṭa

Rudraṭa, wrote *kāuyālaṁkāra* and he stressed importance on *alaṁkara* and totally ignored *dhvani* theory of Ānandavardhana.

Dhanañjaya

Dhanañjaya is the author of the most famous work *Daśarūpa* or *Daśarūpaka* which has replaced Bharata's *Nāṭyasāstra*. He is assigned a date between 974-979 A.D.

Mammaṭa

Mammatā wrote *kāvyamīmamsā* one of the most famous works on poetics. He lived in the 11th century A.D.

Kṣemendra

Kṣemendra who lived in the 11th century A.D. wrote *Aucitya vicāracarcā* or *Aucityālamkāra*. Proprieties in Poetry, and a practical hand book for poets called *kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa* or the ornament for the neck of the poets.

Bhoja

Bhoja wrote his voluminous work larger than any other work on Sanskrit poetics. It deals both poetics and dramaturgy. He lived in the 11th century A.D.

Viśvanātha

Viśvanātha who lived in the 12th century wrote his *sahityadarpaṇa*. which deals with the poetics and dramaturgy.

Jagannāthapaṇḍita

The last important writer on poetics is Jagannātha pandita. He wrote *Rasagangādhara*. He lived in the 17th century. He refutes the *dhvani* theory (implied meaning) and defines the notion of beauty.

The tradition of poetics continued upto the end of the 18th century.

Historic period of the growth of the *alamkārasāstrā* covers broadly a thousand years from 800 to 1800 A.D. This leaves aside Bharata. The activity in its early stages centres in Kashmir to which place belong most famous and original writers on poetics. The place of origin of two earliest writers viz., Bharata and Bhāmaha are not known definitely. The only important exception is found in Dandin who was supposed to have hailed from the South. Later times, we find the activity extending itself to Central India, Gujarat, the Deccan and Bengal.

One can classify the systems of poetics broadly into 1. pre-*dhvani* 2. *Dhvani* and 3. post-*dhvani* system taking *dhvani* as the central land mark.

I. From unknown beginning to Bhāmaha (Formative stage)

II. From Bhamaha to Ānandavardhana, middle of the 7th century to the middle of the 9th century. A.D. (Creative age).

1. Bhāmaha, Udbhaṭa and Rudraṭa (Alamkāra school)
2. Dandin and Vāmana (Rīti)

3. Lollaṭa, Śaṅkuka, Bhaṭṭanāyaka and others (Rasa theory).
4. The *viṣṇudharmottara* and *Agnipuraṇa*.
5. Dhvanikāra and Ānandavardhana.

III. Ānandavardhana to Mammata.

Circa middle of the 9th to the middle of the 11th century (Definitive stage)

1. Abhinavagupta
2. Kuntaka
3. Rudrabhaṭṭa
4. Dhanañjaya and Dhanika
5. Bhoja
6. Mahimabhaṭṭa

IV. From Mammaṭa to Jagannātha-

Circa middle of the 11th century to 18th century (Scholastic stage) (S.K. De)

Sanskrit critical schools as periodised by Chari

Literary Critics

Bharata	Nātyaśāstra	ca. 5th century B.C. to 3rd Century A.D.
Commentators on Bharata		
Lollaṭa		9th century AD
Śaṅkuka		9th century AD
Bhaṭṭanāyaka	Hṛdayadarpaṇa	9th century AD
Abhinavagupta	Abhinavabhārati	10th, 11th century

The Alaṁkāra School (Rhetoric)

Bhāmaha	Kavyālaṁkāra	7th to 8th cent. AD
Dandin	Kāvyādarśa	8th cent. AD
Rudraṭa	Kavyālaṁkāra	9th cent. AD.

The Riti School (style)

Vāmana	Kavyālaṁkāra vṟiti	8th - 9th cent. AD

The Dhvani School (sugge: tion)

Ānandavardhana	9th cent. Ad
Abhinavagupta	10th-11th cent. AD
Mammaṭa	11th cent. AD

Miscellaneous writers on Poetics.

Rājasckhara	10th cent.
Dhanañjaya	10th cent.
Kuntaka	10th-11th cent.
Kṣemendra	11th cent.
Bhoja	11th cent.
Mahimabhaṭṭa	11th cent.
Hemacandra	11th cent.
Ruyyaka	11th cent.
Viśvanātha	12th cent. AD.
Appayyadīkṣita	16th -17th cent. AD.
Jagannātha	17th cent. AD.

Prorody

The beginings of prorody (*chandas*) go back to the Vedic times. The *Brahamanas* record the study of metres. A number of chapters is devoted to prosody in *Sānkhāyana śrauta sutra*. The *Rgveda prātisākhya* and metrical portions of Kātyāyana's *Anukramaṇis* to the *Ṛeveda* and the *Yajurveda*, scientifically treat the prosady (*chandas*). The *chandas* is included among the *Vedaṅgas*. The most important work of the *Vedāṅga* is the *Chandassūtra* of Piṅgala. (Near about 150 B.C) Bharata's

Nāṭyasūtra (chap.XV) deals - prosody and gives numerous examples for individual metre.

Agripurāṇa (chapters 328-334) also deals with the ptosody.

Bṛhatsamhita of Varahamihira (6th cent A.D.) deals with prosody in a chapter (104) devoted to astrology.

Origin and development of Kāvya in Sanskrit

A *kāvya* is a form of art and the beginning of *kāvya* is in the lyric poetry written by a *kavi*. The earlist form of poetry can be traced back to the *sūktas* or hymns of the *Ṛgveda*. The best source of this art form available for the post-Vedic period is the Buddhist canon, *Tripiṭaka* of which the fullest and most authentic recension ńow extant is the Pali canon (586-486 B.C.)

The earlist *kāuya* literature in Sanskrit is Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa. (c.400-150 B.C.) Vālmiki is considered *Ādikavi* 'first poet' and his poetic composition viz., Vālmiki *Rāmāyaṇa, ādikāvya* 'first poetry'.

No poetry, in Sanskrit worth the name is available for the period between 2nd C.B.C. to 2nd C.A.D. It is surmised that during this period, Prakrit poetry was patronised by the ruling class, *Sattasai*, *Bṛhat kathā* and *Therigātha* belong to this period. *Sattasai* is the earliest Mahārāstra *prakrit* lyric a collection of verses (numbering 700) by a Sātavahana king called Hāla who ruled the western Deccan. *Bṛhat kaltā* of Guṇāḍhya is written in *Paiśāci* and *Therigāthā* in *Pali*.

The earliest Sanskrit inscription in *Kāvya* style is that of Rudradāman in the 2nd C.A.D.

Classification of *Kāvya* in Sanskrit

Sanskrit rhetoricians classify all literary compositions into two main division. viz., 1. *dṛśya* class ie. poetry for the eye and 2. *śravya* class ie.

poetry for the ear. The *śravya* class has been subdivided in consideration of its form according to whether it is written in verse form (*padya*) or in prose form (*gadya*) or both in verse and prose (*campu*). It should be remembered *kāvya*, according to Sanskrit writers, does not mean metrical composition only. The word *kāvya* signifies any literary composition whether written in prose or verse form and can be written equally well in Sanskrit or in any one of the languages viz., Prakrit or in Apabhraṁśa.

Dandin discribes a good literary composition in his *Kavyādarśa* (*sargabandho...*). This verse can be rendered into English as under :

It should begin with a benediction, or a homage, or an indication of the subject matter. The plot should be built either upon a legend, a romance or an historical fact suggesting as to how the four ends of life are to be attained, depicting the adventures of a hero overflowing with wisdom and nobility. Descriptions of the town, the sea, the mountain, the seasons, rising of the moon and the sun, sports in pleasure gardens or in tanks, drink banquets, love scenes, feasts, marriages, birth of a son, conferences, emissaries, war expeditions, battles and sieges by heroes etc. go to making of what is an epic. The plot should be so divided as to be permeated by one basic sentiment (*rasa*) with its corresponding emotion (*bhāva*). It shall consist of a number of cantos. (*sargas*) not too long, composed in properly rhythmical and suitable verses'.

Dramatic poetry

Beginnings

Drama in India is supposed to have its main roots in proto ballad poetry. The oldest ballad or dance music of this type, was however such in which stories of gods and demigods were narrated in sacrifices and feasts. As in the case of other countries, so also in India the drama has

its deepest root in the religious cult. Several ceremonies described in the Vedic ritual texts can straightaway be designated as a type of drama.

Dramatic performances, in the post-Vedic period got associated with India's festivals celebrated at the end of the rains and more particularly with the cult of Viṣvṇu (Kṛṣṇa, Rama) and Śiva. The mimic dances of the primitive people contain, the germs of evolution of dramatic act.

The terminology of the drama further proves that such dances were at the root of dramatic performances. The common word for drama in Sanskrit is the neuter *nāṭakam* and the same word as masculine has exactly the same meaning as *naṭa* 'actor' while *nāṭya* means mimic or dramaturgy and *nāṭayati* conveys the sense of mimic representation. All these words are derived from the Prakrit root *naṭ* 'to dance' which corresponds to the Sanskrit root *nṛt, nart*, to dance. Incidentally, Bharata in his definition of drama uses an interesting term *anukaraṇa* meaning 'imitation' ie. mimic (see Bharata).

The plots of drama based on the legends of deities, the invoctory verses, its association with the religious festival etc. etc. prove undoubtedly the religious origion of the drama.

The ten types of drama

Bharata lists 10 types of drama in his *Nāṭya śāstra*. They are : *Nāṭaka, Prakaraṇa, Aṅka, Vyāyoga, Bhāṇa, Samavakāra, Vīthi, Prahasana, Ḍima* and *Ihāmṛga*.

1. Nāṭaka : This is the most important form of drama.

The plot of a drama should be a well known subject, the hero should equally be well known and exacted. It should describe the life and work of one in the family of royal sages, should use episodes connected with the divinities, should comprise of the hero's several achievements. All the sentiments, especially, those of love and heroism should find an

expression in a drama. The language should necessarily be dignified and elevated. A *nāṭaka* should have minimum 5 acts or maximum 10 acts.

2. The Prakaraṇa : The plot is a creation of the author. The hero is a Brahmana, a minister, a merchant, etc. but never a king, or a god. It should have 5 to 10 acts. Otherwise its requirements should be the same as those of a drama eg. *Mṛcchakaṭikam*.

3. Bhāṇa : It is a monologue in one act. A *viṭa* (sly world ling) appears and narrates his jokes in conversation with imaginary persons whose talk he repeats. All possible situations come to be represented and different sentiments are aroused through the conversation, and through a great display of mimics. The fable is fashioned by the writer in a manner, of his liking and in most of the *Bhāṇa*, that we possess, it is erotic.

4. The prahasana : It is a farce in one or two acts. The theme that is mostly erotic is fabricated. The hero is an asectic or a Brahmana, a king or a rogue and the rest of the characters are the courtiers, eunuchs, servants, beggars, *viṭa* (bonvivants) villains, prostitutes, and procureses. It is meant to stimutale humour. e.g. *Bhagavadajjukīyam. Mattavilāsa, prahasana*.

5. The Ḍima : It is in four acts with the theme as some fable taken either from mythology or from popular sayings. Its hero is either a god, demigod or demon. Any sentiment excepting love and humour may be generated according to option.

6. The Vyāyoga : It is a military show play in one act. The theme is generally well known. The hero is a well known person and has only a few woman character. e.g. *Madhyama vyāyoga* of Bhāsa.

7. The Samavakāra : It is a drama played in heaven. The characters are gods and demons and the hero is a well known personality. The NS mentions of a *samavakāra* written by Brahma, the theme being *Amṛtamathana*

8. The Vīthi : A single act play with only two characters. It is a little different from the *Bhāṇa*.

9. The Utsṛṣṭāṅka : It is an one act play with the pathos (*karuṇa*) as the dominant sentiment. The characters are generally human being. It should have lamentation of bereaved women after the cessation of postilitres. The theme is some well known story that is elaborated with interpolation eg. *Ūrubhaṅga* of Bhāsa.

10. The Īhāmṛga : It has for its male characters divine beings who come to fight over divine women. Its plot is of love dealing with discord among women, their abduction and inflicting punishment. The *Īhāmṛga* is to be composed as a well designed literary composition.

These ten are also called *rūpakas*. In addition to these 10, *uparūpakas*, numbering 18 are listed in the later treatises on poetics. (Visvanātha) of which two deserve to be mentioned.

The Nāṭika

The plot is invented and the story refers to a royal harem, music and a girl. The hero is a king. It has many female characters and is in four acts. It has an abundance of dance, song and dialogue and (the pleasure of) the union of love is its soul. It is concerned with the mode and behaviour of the king and has such displays of conciliation, anger, and pretence. The king, his queen, female messenger and the palace attendants are the *dramatis personae* (eg. *Ratnāvali*, *Priyadarsikā*)

The Troṭaka

It is in five to nine acts and the action is played partly in the human world and partly in the divine world. (eg. *Vikramorvasīya*).

Characters

Bharata has devoted the whole of chapter No. 34 to the explanation of the types of various character and their qualities. He says that characters male and female are in general of three types : superior (*uttama*), middling (*madhyama*) and inferior (*adhama*). Then he goes on to explain the qualities of each type in detail which are as under :

Male Characters

1. **Superior :** He is self-controlled, wise, honest, skilled in arts and crafts, well versed in śāstras, expert in enjoyment and at the same time, glave, patient, and munificent.

2. **Middling :** He is well mannered, proficient in arts and crafts, well versed in sāstras, wise, sweet and courteous.

3. **Inferior :** He is harsh, ill-mannered, low-spirited, criminally disposed, mean, haughty, ungrateful, indolent, expert in insulting honoured persons, covetuous of women, fond of quarrel and treacherous.

Female characters

1. **Superior :** She has a tender nature, is not fickle, speaks smilingly, is free from cruely, respects her superiors, bashful, good-mannered, grave and patient and has natural beauty and nobobility.

2. **Middling :** She does not possess the qualities enumerated above to a great extent and has some faults mixed with them.

3. **Inferior :** She is more or less like the inferior male character.

Bharata then briefly mentions characters of a mixed nature among whom may be included the maid servants, the sakāra, the viṭa and the hermophrodite who is still inferior.

Four types of heroes

1. *dhīrodātta* or the self controlled and exalted
2. *dhīraprasānta* or the selfcontrolled and calm.
3. *dhīralalita* or the self controlled and light hearted.
4. *dhīroddhata* or the self-controlled and haughty.

Rāma in Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacaritam*, *Cārudatta* in Śūdraka's *Mṛcchakaṭikam* and *Duṣyanta* in Kalidasa's Śākuntalam are examples respectively of the first three types of heroes. The fourth type is Ravaṅa in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

The heroines (*nāyikas*, who may be goddesses, queens, women of high family or courtezans) too, on the basis of their varied characteristics have been classified as under :

1. *dhīrā* or self-controlled
2. *lalitā* or light-hearted
3. *udāttā* or exalted
4. *nibhṛtā* or modest.

Bharata also gives four classes of jesters or *vidūṣakas*, who are *sannyāsins*, brahmins, other twice-born castes and disciples in cases respectively of gods, kings, ministers and Brahmins. They should be the confidants and companions of the hero during his seperation from the beloved and experts in conversation.

Bharata also states who should be the hero when there are many male characters, the hero is the one who being in misfortune or distress, ultimately attains salvation. If there are more than one of such description, one whose misfortune and elevation are prominent, shall be the hero.

The tradition, further classifies the hero according to his attitude to his female relations. Thus, the hero or lover is classified into *pati* husband and *upapati* or *vaisika* 'paramourt'. Since ancient India knows the system

of polygamy hero devoted to several wives was not considered less respectful.

According to the respective natures the hero could be courteous (*dakṣiṇa*) deceitful (*śaṭha*), shameless (*dhṛṣṭa*) and a faithful lover (*anukūla*) since these four types could be found in the four basic classes, this raises the figure to sixteen. According to their station in life these sixteen could be chosen from the high, middle or low sections of society which raises the number to forty eight.

Later tradition fully recognizes the polygamous nature of the male and makes concession for the hero's association with his own wife (*svakīyā*) another person's wife (*parakīya*) and even with a courtesan (*sādharaṇi*). Bharata adds one more category viz. the divine heroine (*divyā*) as in the case of Purūravas and Ūrvasi.

Further division is possible on the basis of her being the first love or a later love. Another division is suggested on the basis of relationship with the hero which has eight different situations.

Rasa School

Bharata and his Nāṭyaśāstra

References to dramatic performances are not only found in the early Brahmanical and Buddhist literature but also in the grammatical treatises of Panini and Patañjali. Existence of earlier works on dramaturgy has been referred to by Bharata himself in his *Nāṭyāṣastra*. Still, it is the *Nāṭyāṣastra* alone is so far the earliest known and authoritative work on this form of art. Thus, while the beginning of dramaturgy may be traced back to remote antiquity, the credit of systematising Sanskrit drama justly goes to Bharata the father of Sanskrit dramaturgy.

Nāṭya or drama is supposed to have been created by Brahma himself as the fifth Veda and asked Bharata to put it to actual production and

performance. (NS.I 12, 15, 16). This statement of Bharata is clear evidence to put the stamp of divine origin to dramatic art, as well. It is said that the recitative (*pāṭhya*) part is taken from the Ṛgveda, song or melody from the Sāmaveda, *abhinaya* or acting from the Yajurveda and sentiments are from the Atharvaveda. The elements supposed to have been taken from the four Vedas to make it as the fifth Veda suggests that *nāṭya* consists of four principal components, viz. recitation (*pāṭhya*), songs(*gīta*), sentiments (*rasa*) and hystrionic representation (*abhinaya*).

The word *nāṭya* as defined in the NS shows that it is an imitation (*anukaraṇa* from *anutkṛ* to imitate). The word *nāṭya* a derivative from the root *naṭ* a Prakṛit form of Sanskrit root *nṛt* to 'dance' indicates that the word for drama is derived from the root meaning dance, in other words the dance and drama own their origin to the same root *nṛt* in Sanskrit. The theatre is still called dancing house in Combodia.

We find an interesting parallel in Tamil also. The word *kūttu* in Tamil denotes both dance and drama. Tamil lexicon records several words derived from *kūttu* such as *kūttāṭi* 'dancer, player, actor' *kūttāṭutal* to act, or dance on the stage. '*kūtti*' female actor, dancer, dancing girl, courtesan, *kūttukkaḷari* 'play house', *kūttuppāṭṭu* songs sung, dancing and dramatic performance and so on.

Tamil and Sanskrit words mentioned above, indicate that a single word is used to denote both dance and drama. In other words, the dramatic art had both dancing and acting as its components.

The *Nāṭyaśāstra* makes use of three different words *nāṭya*, *nṛtya* and *nṛtta*, all derived from the root *nṛt* (Sanskrit) or *naṭ* Prakrit. The dramatic art (*nāṭya*) consists of all three. *Nāṭya* form is represented by several persons, *nṛtya* and *nṛtta* needed a single person only.

Author

Who is Bharata?

Though Bharata is considered as the father of Indian Dramaturgy, his identity as the author of the *Nāṭyaśastra* is shrouded in mystery. We are not in a position to say who Bharata was. The word Bharata actually means an actor and the word Bharata figures in the *Nāṭyaśastra* as its author and as stage manager. The account in the NS places Bharata in the direct line of Brahma as one who received the fifth Veda from the creater God (NS GOS I). Raghavan thinks Bharata belongs to a Vedic tribe. Ghosh is of opinion that Bharata was probably of non-Indian origin. Sekhar, is inclined to the same view and thinks that Bharata could only be a scion of a non-Aryan family of artists of Southern origin.

The date of Nāṭyaśāstra

Divergent views have been expressed regarding the date of the *Nāṭyaśastra* similar to the identify of its author. It has been veriously assigned to periods ranging from the 5th century B.C. to the 4th century A.D. M.M. Kane thinks that the original work consisting of rasasūtra, portions on music and acting may have been composed by 200 B.C. and the rest of the material with the present form of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* was ready by about the 3rd or 4th century A.D. Ghosh thinks that original text of the *Nāṭyaśastra* was most probably written in the 5th century BC and the present work existed in 200 AD and might probably go back to 100 BC.

It is very difficult to determine the exact date of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* with any certainty. It appears that the whole of the text as it has come down to us could not have been written at one and the same time by a single author. The four different styles in which the *Nāṭyaśastra* is written as pointed out by De do not possibly belong to the same period. There are

in the present text traces of 1. independant prose fragments, 2. *ānuvaṁśya ślokas* in *ārya* and *anuṣṭubh* metres 3. passages in *sutra* style and 4. the present systematic *kārika*. These different styles indicate several stages in the growth of particular forms of composition. This leads us to believe that the *Nāṭyaśastra* continues to be recast and replenished over a long period of time.

Paul Regnaud, the great French Sanskritist and one of the earliest scholars to study critically the text of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, writes in his preface to Grosset's edition (1898) 'One remark to be made at the beginning in this regard is that one would be misled in looking for one unquie and fixed date for it, which like similar texts in India, was undoubtedly amplified and modified in course of centuries following developments and changes of the art. It is therefore indispertable that the text of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* underwent a process of gradual interpolation, revision and revamping'.

The contents of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*

The *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata is the earliest extant work on poetics. It contains the first exposition of the *rasa* theroy which has since dominated our approach towards literature. All latest systems and theories spring from Bharata whom even Ānandavardhana himself in applying the *rasa* theory to poetics names as his original authority. His *Nāṭyaśāstra* is a monumental trealise almost an encyclopedia dealing with all conceivable aspects of Drama-emotions, sentiments, histrionics, dance, music, prosody, metrical patterns, diction, stage-effects, costumes, make up and the training of actors and actresses. Bharata conceived of Drama as a synthesis of all the arts. It is significant to note that Bharata uses the same term viz. *kavi* for both poet and dramatist.

The *Nāṭyaśastra* contains 6000 couplets spread over thirty-six chapters. It consists of both verse form and prose passages. Bharata

himself has given the *Nāṭyaśastra* or the Digest of his *Nāṭyaśastra* in one of the stanza in VI 10. The *Saṅgraha* comprises of the *rasas*, *bhāvas*, *Abhinaya* gesticulatory representation, *dharmi* (rehearsed practice), *vṛtti* (style) *pravṛtti* (action), *siddhi* (achievement), *svaras* (notes), *ātodya or* (musical instruments), *gāna* (song) and *raṅga* (the stage).

He enumerates eleven elements of Drama, as *rasa* or sentiment, *bhāva* or emotion, *abhinaya* or acting, *dharmi* or modes of representation, *vṛtti* or styles of expression, *pravṛtti* or local usages, *siddhi* or success of production, *svara* or note, *ātodya* or musical instruments, *gāna* or song, and *raṅga* or theatre. These eleven elements are the most important components of Drama. There are eight *rasas*, forty-nine *bhāvas*, four types of *abhinaya*, two types of *dharmi*, four types *of vṛtti* and *pravṛtti* each. There are two ways of *siddhi* and seven different notes of *svara*. *Ātodya* is of four kinds, *gāna* of five variations and *ranga* of three shapes.

The design of the book may be indicated as under :

Chapter 1 : Mythical origin of *Nāṭyaśastra* from the four Vedas to fulfil the *krīḍanīka* (plaything) for all people. Value and importance of *Nāṭya* for pleasure and instruction.

Chapter 2 : Construction of a play house, three kinds of theatres, architectural details and arrangement of different parts.

Chapter 3 : Worship of deities located in *nāṭyaveśma*.

Chapter 4 : Definitions and use of *karaṇas* and *angahāra* (hand, feet and body position and movements).

Chapter 5 : *Pūrvaraṅga* or the ritual and musical preliminaries of play productions.

Chapter 6 : Treatment of *rasa* : definition, varieties and their characteristics.

Chapter 7 : Nature of *bhāvas* and their relation to *rasa*.

Chapter 8-12 : Meaning and kinds of *abhinaya*

Chapter 8 : *Āṅgika abhinaya* : movements of major and minor limbs of body; glimpses.

Chapter 9 : *Abhinaya* of minor limbs, hand gestures and their uses.

Chapter 10 : Foot movements (*cāri*) their characteristics, kinds, and uses, poses.

Chapter 11 : Round movements (*maṇḍala*)

Chapter 12 : Gaits of different characters and for various moods;

Chapter 13 : Zonal divisions of the stage; *lokadharmi* and *nātyadharmi*, *abhinaya*, break in act; *pravṛtti*.

Chapter 14-18: *Vācika abhinaya* and literary aspects

Chap. 14 : Vowels and consonants their places of origin parts of speach, grammatical cases, euphonic combinations, compounds and so on. Rules of prosody.

Chap. 15: Metres and their employment.

Chapter 16: *Lakṣaṇa* and *alaṁkāras*, Diction of a play;

Chapter 17 : Rules on the use of languages; Sanskrit and Prakrit for dramatic characters; *kāku* or intonation; modes of address in dramatic dialogue.

Chapter 18 :Patterṇs of dramatic compositions of *Daśarūpa*, their definitions and characteristics.

Chapter 19 : Structure of drama, Plot and its constituents, junctures (sandhi) and their parts, suggestive devices.

Chapter 20 : The four *vṛttis-Bharati*, *Kaiśiki*, *Sāttvati* and *Ārabhati*.

Chapter 21 : *Āharya abhinaya* : *nepathya*, its kinds, ornaments, make-up and costumes.

Chapter 22 : *Sāmanya* or *sāttvika abhinaya* : *bhāva, hāva, helā* : *līlā* grace or expression and movements; classification of woman for dramatic presentation, moods and mental states, eight kinds of *nāyikas* in phases of love (*aṣṭanāyikā*) certain taboos on stage-representation.

Chapter 23 : *vaiśika* (expert on matters of love and his characteristics, the female messenger (*dūti*) her qualities and role.

Chapter 24 : classification of men as dramatic characters; *nāyaka, nāyikā* other dramatic characters like *śakara, vidūṣaka,* chief queen, men and women in the harem.

Chapter 25 : *citrābhinaya* : symbolic representation by gestures and facial expressions of moods; things, happenings like sunrise, sunset, seasons, scene of action etc. cannot be actually presented on stage; modes of speech delivery.

Chapter 26 : Introduction of animals etc. on the stage; men and women as dramatic characters; two kinds of performance, delicate (*sukumāra*) and vigorours(*aviddha*).

Chapter 27 : Success of dramatic presentation and competitions; factors of success; blemishes leadings to failures; principles for judging and selection of a panel of judges; judgement and award of merit (*patāka-dāna*) expectation from a dramatic performance, attitude and response of a spectator.

Chap. 28-34 : Section on music and musical instruments.

Chapter 28 : *jāti, svara, mūrcchanā.*

Chapter 29 : Musical orchestra and preliminaries

Chapter 30 : Lute and its mode of playing.

Chapter 31 : on *tāla*

Chapter 32 : *Dhruva* songs, their kinds, compositions and employment.

Chapter 33 : Qualities and defects of singers and of musical instruments.

Chapter 34 : kinds of drums and their playing.

Chapter 35 : Selection of actors for dramatic roles, and responsibility of producer-director.

Chapter 36 : Story of curse on actors for ridiculing the sages, degradation of actors, as a class.

Chapter 37 : (in GOS ed.) Descent of drama on earth; importance and greatness of *nāṭyaśāstra*.

Bharata lists eight *rasas* or sentiments and eight *sthāyībhāvas* or abiding mental conditions. They are

rasa	**sthāyibhāva**
1. *śṛṅgāra* or the erotic	1. *rati* or love
2. *hāsya* or the comic	2. *hāsa* or laughter
3. *karuṇa* or pathetic	3. *śoka* or sorrow
4. *raudra* or furious	4. *krodha* or anger
5. *vīra* or heroic	5. *utsāha* or energy
6. *bhayānaka* or terrible	6. *bhayam* or fear
7. *bibhatsa* or odious	7. *jugupsā* or disgust.
8. *adbhuta* or wonder	8. *vismaya* or astonishment

vyabhicāri bhāvas or transit mental state (33)

1. *nirveda* or despondency
2. *glāni* or sinking or weakness
3. *śaṅkā* or apprehension

4. *asūyā* or jealousy or envy.
5. *mada* or intoxication o· pride
6. *śrama* or fatigue
7. *ālasyam* or indolence.
8. *dainyam* or depression
9. *cintā* or anxicty
10. *moha* or infatuation
11. *smṛti* or recollection
12. *dhṛti* or steadiness or courage
13. *vrīḍā* or shame
14. *capalatā* or impulsiveness or inconstancy
15. *harṣa* or exhilaration or joy
16. *āvega* or agitation or impetuousness
17. *jaḍatā* or stupor or inactivity
18. *garva* or conceit
19. *viṣāda* or despair
20. *autsukyam* or eagerness or impetuousness
21. *nidrā* or sleep
22. *apasmāra* or epilepsy
23. *suptam* or dreaming
24. *vibodha* or awakening
25. *amarṣa* or indignation
26. *avahittham* or concealment (by pretext) of inner emotion or dissimulation.
27. *mati* or thoughtfulness.
28. *vyādhi* or sickness or disease
29. *unmāda* or madness or insanity
30. *maraṇa* or death

31. *trāsa* or fright
32. *vitarka* or wavering or hesitation

Sāttvikabhāvas (8)

1. *stambha* or paralysis
2. *sveda* or perspiration
3. *romañca* or horripilation
4. *svarabhaṅga* or voice breaking
5. *vepathuḥ* or tremor
6. *vaivarṇya* or change of colour
7. *aśru* or tear
8. *pralaya* or complete loss of consciousness

Rasa theory

The meaning of the word varies according to the context in which it is used. Rasa literally means taste, relish or flavour. Rasa meaning 'savour' or taste becomes very common in the AV.

tīvro raso madhupṛcām aṅga (AV.III 13.15). 'May the strong satisfying savour (*rasa*) of the honey mixed come to me', *jihvayā hi rasān vijānāti* (Brh.up.III. 2.4)' knows the taste by the tongue.'

Taittirīya Upanisad says that the esssence of the Bhahman is *rasa*, the individual, on realising this Brahman, becomes one with bliss.

raso vai saḥ rasam hyevāyam labdhvā-anandi bhavati (Tai up II.) Bharata defines *rasa* as 'That which is relished is *rasa*'.

Rasa-sutra of Bharata

The first and the earliest exponent of the *rasa*-theory is Bharata the renowened author of *Naṭyaśāstra*. The *rasa-sūtra* occurs in the sixth chapter of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*:

vibhāvānubhāva vyabhicāri samyogād rasaniṣpattiḥ

When *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and the *uyabhicāribhāvas* combine to awaken the *sthāyibhāva* finally develops into *rasa*. (Krishna chaitanya). This definition in itself, leads us nowhere, because the union referred to in the sutra is not the union of *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *vyabhicaribhāva* among themselves but their alignment with the permanent emotion known as *sthāyibhāva* which does not find any mention in this sutrā but occurs in the dialogue that follows........the permanent emotions (*sthāyībhāvas*) when they unite with the various other emotions. (*vibhā vānubhāva uvybhicāri bhāvas*) attain the quality of *rasa*.

Vibhāvas are the stimuli that activate emotion. These stimuli are of two kinds - *ālambana* or human and *uddībana* or environment. For example in the case of the *ratī*, *sthāyibhāva* (the permanent emotion of love) the beloved is the *alambana vibhāva*. She is the main-stay responsible for the arousal of the emotion of love. The spring season, the moon lit night, the soft breeze and the fragrance of flowers are the *uddīpana vibhāva* (the excitant stimuli), so called because they help enhance the emotive effect of the focal point, the beloved.

Anubhāvas, on the other hand, are the external manifestations of the emotions evoked or excited by the *vibhāvas*. They are quickly moving eye brows, side long glances and so on. Bharata explains that *anubhāva* is so called because it makes the spectators feel or experience the effect of *abhinaya* by means of words, gestures and *sattva*. Thus the *anubhāvas* communicate to the audience and spectaters the emotion being experienced by the characters. These manifestations of emotions whether through words or gestures are voluntary. They spring from the intention of the characters swayed by emotion to communicate it to others. But there are some other manifestations which are involuntary such as perspiration, change of colour, horripilation and trembling. These spontaneous and involuntary manifestations of emotion are called *sattvika bhāvas* by Bharata.

Vyabhicāribhāvas are transitory or evanascent emotions that tend, only to develop the main sentiment love etc. A person in love for example, may experience apprehension, envy, anxiety, joy, meloncholy and the like. All these feelings are related to the principal emotions emerging from it and again being submerged in it like the waves in the occan. Bharata explains that the word *vyabhicari bhāva* consists of prefixes of *vi* and *abhi* and the root *car* to move. Since they move in relation to the principal emotion and help it emerge as sentiment (*rasa*), they are called *vyabhicāribhāva*.

The Realization of Rasa

The theory of *rasa* explains the rise and nature of aesthetic pleasure that a responsive audience experiences while watching the skillful enactment of a play. Bharata explains the realisation of *rasa* in a very simple language i.e. the realisation of *rasa* is the result of the union of the *sthāyibhāva* with *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas* and *vyabhicaribhāvas*. Thus according to Bharata the *sthāyibhāva* or the permanent emotion is the basis of *rasa*. The *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas* and *vyabhicāri bhāvas* awaken this innate emotion. Bharata unambiguously explains that *rasa* is so called because it is capable of being relished. (*asvādayatvāt*)

Now the question is that on whom rests the realisation of *rasa*, ie. whether the actor realizes the *rasa*, or the spectater, or both or poet or all of them. The *rasasūtrā* of Bharata has been interpreted variously by different commentalors. Though their commentaries are not available, we could get information regarding the views of the commentators from Abhinavagupta's work. The word *nispatti* in the *rasasūtra* of Bharata has been interpreted variously. The word *niṣpatti* is interpreted as generation, inference, generalisation and so on.

Bhaṭṭalollaṭa (generation theroy)

According to Lollaṭa *rasa* is generated by the trained actors by their hystrionic representation through *vibhāva*, and *anubhāva* etc. He is of the opinion that *rasa* resides both in the represented character and the imitating actor. But it is not clear how a mental state which belongs to the hero, can be transferred to the actor, and how the spectator can be charmed by a feeling which does not exist in him. (De,1923). It leaves out of all consideration the poet and the audience.

Śaṅkuka, (inference theory)

Saṅkuka criticises Lollaṭa's view saying that *rasa* is not produced by the skillful representation. He maintains that *rasa* is inferred by the spectator and the inferred feeling is realised by him as *rasa*. The permanent mood of the hero is inferred to exist in the actor (though not actually existing in him) by means of the *vibhavas* etc. clearly exhibited by him in his successful acting, so as to produce an illūsion of identity with the feelings of the hero and when spectaters witness them (characters) experience through the imitation of the actors, they inferentially experience the emotions of the characters themselves. The inferential experience is the realization of *rasa*.

This theory is an improvement upon Lollaṭa's in that it brings in the spectators also in the realization of *rasa*.

Lollaṭa's theory of generation includes in the realization of *rasa* the charater and the actor, Śankuka theory of inference goes beyond the character and the actor, and establishes that the *rasa* is the feeling of the spectators. The defect in inference theory is that any inferential knowledge lacks that sense of fulness which is present in the fulness of

joy. Therefore it is unsound to say that realisation of *rasa* is the process of inference.

Bhaṭṭanāyaka's theory of generalisation (*sādhāranīkaraṇa*)

Bhaṭṭanāyaka has very ably solved the riddle of the enjoyment of *rasa* by the spectators or the readers by putting forward the doctrine of *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa* or generalisation or universalisation. According to Bhaṭṭanāyaka, *rasa* is neither produced nor perceevied, nor manifested. He posits special capacity of poetic language called *bhāvakatva*. He explains the realisation of *rasa* as poetic language has three aspects or functions. viz., 1) *abhidhā* or significative capacity 2) *bhāvanā* or *bhāvakatva*, or unificatory or universalising aspect and 3) *bhojakatva* or *bhoga* or enjoyment aspect or realisation.

Bhāvakatva operates in the following manner : When there is a vivid representation, aided by poetry, music etc. of the characters and the incident, the trained spectator or *sahṛdaya*, through his complete imaginative sympathy, identifies himself with them and loses his individuality and also any personal predilections that he may have ie. if the love of the Duṣyanta and Śakuntala should be presented on the stage it is not realized as the love of these particular characters, but through the unification of the characters, actors and the *sahṛdayas* the individual love of the characters, the actors and the *sahṛdaya* is completely submerged and love in its universal aspect alone is presented. This universal function is called *sādhāraṇikaraṇa*. When the emotion is thus universalised, the third function, viz; *bhojakatva* operates when the Sahṛdaya experiences that kind of bliss which an *yogi* experiences when he identifies himself with the supreme Brahman. this is what is called the realisation of *rasa*.

Abhinavagupta

Sahṛdayas or responsive critics have certain inborn *vāsanas* or instincts which are called in the language of criticism *sthāyībhāvas* when there is a vivid representation of the *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas* and *vyabhicāribhāvas* this instinct is roused by watching or reading a good petry. It reaches it climax enabling the *sahṛdayas* to experience the thrill or joy.

Kalidāśa's verse in the *Abhijñānaśakuntalam* brings home this point. The verse reads as :

ramyāṇi vīkṣya madurāṁśca niśamyaśaban
paryutsukī bhavati yatsukhino'pi jantuḥ
taccetasā smarati nūnam abodhapūrvam
bhāvasthirāṇi jananantara sauḥrdāni

(V.2.)

Not seldom in our happy hours of ease,
when thought is still, the sight of some fair form,
or mournful fall of music breathing low,
with stir strange fancies, and a sense
of vague yet earnest, can it be
That the dim memory of events long past
or friendships formed in other states of being
Flits like a passing shadow over the spirit -----------

Kalidāsa refers to the same *vāsanā* in the last line *bhavasthirāṇi* etc.

Abhinavagupta then explains who is *sahṛdaya* : *sahṛdayas* are defined as those who by repeated reading poetry, have developed the capacity to identify themselves with the poet, and attuned to the poets heart. (*sahṛdaya* = *samānahṛdaya*)

Alamkara School

Important contributors of this system are Bhāmaha, Udbhaṭa and Rudraṭa, the earlist exponents of *alaṁkāra* system.

In Bhāmala's *Kāvyālaṁkāra* different topics of poetics are formulated not incidentally as in Bharata, but in such well defined outline. This would indicate that *Alaṁkāra sāstra* had already attained the rank of an independent discipline. Bharata, considers certain important elemets of poetry as devices for embellishment for dramatic speech as such it is subservient to the principal purpose of producing dramatic *rasa*. In Bhāmaha, on the other hand, the poetical embellishments form the principal object of study.

The two important factors, which go to make up the *kāuyasarīra* i.e. the body of external frame work of poetry are supposed to be *śabda* (word) and *artha* (sense) and the *alaṁkāra* of poetic figures which adorn these are taken as forming the essential sign of a *kāvya*. In other words, poetry consist of a verbal composition in which a definite sense must pervail, and which must be made charming by means of certain terms of expression to which the name of poetic figure is given (De : 1925-4)

Although, Bhāmaha is the oldest representative of this system, he was by no means, its originator. He himself recognises the figures mentioned by the rhetoricians anterior to him. Bhāmaha states at the outset the purpose of poetry and the qulification of a poet. According to Bhāmha a *kāvya* consists of *śabda* and *artha (ṣabdārthau sahitam kāvyam)* i.e. he gives equal prominence to word and sense in poatry. The *kāvya* should also be fault less *(nirdoṣa)* and embellished by poetic figures (*sālaṁkāra*). Then he classifies poetry (i) according to form into verse and prose ii) according to the language, employed, Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhraṁsà iii) according to the subject matter into four fold division-incidents human or divine, incidents invented by the poet's imagination or incidents based on several arts and sciences iv) conventionally grouped five fold divisions

a) *sargabandha* (*mahākāvya*) b) *abhineyārtha* (drama), c) *ākhyāyikā*, d) *kathā* and e) *anibaddha kāvya* (ie detached poems like *gāthas* or individual ślokas.)

Bhāmaha defines and discusses with illustrations the poetic figures or *alamkāras*. He devotes two long chapters for this topic ii 4-95, iii 1-56 spreading nearly one hundred and fifty verses. He also mentions the *doṣas* or demerits of composition. iv and concludes with the discussion on the logical and grammatical correctness of poetry in chapter V and VI. According to Bhāmaha, the highest importance in poetry is the *alaṁkāras* or the poetic figure which takes the bulk of his treatment.

Udbhaṭa is said to have written *Bhāmaha vivaraṇa* or *kavyalaṁkāra vivṛti* and *Alaṁkāra saṅgraha* the former is non-available. His existing work viz. *Alaṁkāra saṅgraha* aś its name iṁplies consists of merely a collection of verses defining forty one figures. (Including three varieties of *anuprāsas*). This work consits of six chapters which exclusively with the poetic figures. The content of the six chapters are :

1) *Punaruktavadābhāsa, chekānuprāsa, vrttyanuprāsa (with the three vṛttis), lāṭānuprāsa, rūpaka, dīpaka* (3 kinds), *upamā, prativastū pamā.*

2) *ākṣepa, arthantaranyāsa, vyatireka, vibhāvana, samasokti, atisayokti* (4 kinds)

3) *Yathā saṁkhya, utprekṣā, svabhavokti*

4) *preyasvat, rasavat, urjasvin, paryāyoktas samāhita, udātta (2 kinds), sleṣa,*

5) *apahnuti, viseṣokti, virodha, tulyayogita, aprastutapraśaṃsā, vyājastuti. vidarśanā, samkara* (4 kinds), *upameyopamā, sahokti, parivṛtti*

6) *sasaṁdeha, ananvaya, samsṛṣṭi, bhāvika, kāvyaliṅga* (*hetu*) and *kāvyadṛṣṭānta.*

In his treatment, of these figures, Udbhaṭa follws *Bhāmaha* very closely , enumerating the figures in the same order and even borrowing his definitions (literally) of a large number of figures. Udbhata, properly carried the tradition of Bhāmaha and gave a systematic exposition of his work. Bhamaha , indeed, demands respect due to his antiquity, but to later writers it was Udbhaṭa who is the authoritative exponent of this system and turn to the work of Udbhaṭa as the standard one. We can say without hesitation that Udbhaṭa estabhished the *alaṁkaṛa* doctrine in Kashmir.

Rudraṭa in his work *kāvyālaṁkāra* devotes ten chapters for *alaṁkaṛa* or poetic figure. He considers *alaṁkāra* as an important element in poetry. Rudraṭa treats *alaṁkāra* or poetic figure eleborately and it is exhaustive as well. He has adapted a different method and the treatment appears that he is following a tradition other than the one follwoed by his predecessor Bhāmaka. Rudraṭa adds nearly thirty more independant figures to Udbhaṭa's poetic figures. The number of *alaṁkāras* discussed in Udbhaṭa is forty one where as in Rudraṭa it is sixty eight.

The sixteen chapter in Rudraṭa's deal with the following subjects : 1) The purpose or object of poetry, the qualifications of a poet etc. ii) The four *rītis* (*pāñcali, lāṭīyā, gauḍīyā and vaidarbhi*), the six *bhaṣas* (Prakrit, Sanskrit, Magadha, Piśāca, Surasenī, Apabhraṁśa) and the five *alaṅkāras* of *śabda*, iii) *yamaka* iv) *śleṣa*, v) *citra*, vi) *sabdadoṣas* including *doṣas* of *pada* and *vākya*, vii) four basis of *arthālāṁkara* (*vāstava, aupamya, atiśaya* and *śleṣa* and the figures based on *vāstava* viii) figures based on *aupamya*, ix) figures based on *atiśaya*, x) figures based on *śleṣa*, xi) *doṣas of artha* including *upamā-doṣas*, xii) ten *rasas* and treatment of *śṛṅgāra* xiii) *sambhoga śṛṅgaṛa* etc. xiv) *vipralambha śṛṅgaṛa* and the *upayas* xv) characteristics of other *rasas* xvi) kinds of poetic compostions and their characteristics.

Rudraṭa is the last exponent of the *alaṁkāra* school. After him the school began to decline and merge ultimately like the two other schools *rasa* and *rīti* into the finally domimant *Dhvani* school.

The Riti System

Dandin

Dandin is influnced to some extent by the teachings of *Alaṁkāra* school and as such stands midway between the *alaṁkāra* system of Bhāmaha and the *rīti* system of Vāmana.

Dandin like Bhāmaha, start with the notion of embellishing sound and sense which in their (i.e. Bhāmaha and Dandin) view should constitute the body of poetry. Dandin also classifies poetry into species of composition like the *sarga-bandha* etc. He mentions *sargabandha* (= *mahākāvya*) *muktaka* (single verse), *kulaka* (five verses) *koṣa* (unconnected verses of differents authors) and *saṅghāta* 'unconnected verses of the same author). Under prose he speaks of *kathā*, *ākhyāyikā* and *campū*. Poetry is classified, according to its form into prose, verse and mixed. While language furnishes another basis yielding four distinct groups, viz., *saṁskṛta*, *prākrita*, *apabhramsa* and *miśra*. Thus, four species of composition emerge out of these five principles of classification viz. *sargabandha* (*mahākāvya*) in Sanskrit, *skandhaka* in Prakrit *asara* in Apabhraṁśa and *nāṭaka* in mixed languages. He refers to the other type of classificaion, as *śravya* and *prekṣya kāvyas* also.

He shares the views of Alaṁkara school that a good *kāvya* should be embellished by those decorative devices which go by the name *alaṁkāra*. At the same time, one can notice, he differs in his view from the early writers as to the view to the means by which the embellishment should he realised. He holds the view that it is not the poetic figures only which ad arm to the poetry but *guṇas* that constitute the essence

of the poetic manners (*mārgas*) or poetic diction. ie. he emphasises the role of *mārga* which adds beauty to the poetry.

Dandin defines poetry as *iṣṭārtha vyavacchinnā padāvalī* (I-10) a series of words characterised by an agreeable sense or idea. He naturally discusses the suitable arrangement of sound and sense for the purpose of producing poetic effect which is technically called *mārga* or *rīti*. He divides *mārga* into two distinguishable types called *vaidarbha* and *gauḍa*. His whole study is devoted to these two. He gives preference to the *vaidarbha mārga* which according to him result from the harmonious unification of the ten *gunas*. or excellences of composition, the *gauḍa* being the opposite of it. He enumerates these ten *gunas*.

After dealing with the *gunas*, Dandin proceeds to speak about the *alaṁkāras* or poetic figures (chap. II). Dandin uses the term *alaṁkāra* in the sense that which causes beauty in poetry, *kāvyaśobhākarān dharmān alaṁkārān pracakṣate*. According to him, poetic figures are *alaṁkāras* common to both the *mārgas* (*sādhāraṇa*) i.e. *vaidarbha* and *gauḍa*; *guṇas* are *alaṁkāras* belonging exclusively to the *Vaidrbha*

kaścin mārga-vibhāgārtham uktaḥ prāg apyalaṁkriyaḥ
sādhāraṇam alaṁkārajātam adya pradarśyati (II3)

"For the purpose of classifying the *mārgas*, some *alaṁkāras* have been already spoken of (by me in the previous chapter); now are shown those *alaṁkāras* which are common (to both the *margās*)".

Thus, *guṇas* enumerated earlier in relation to *vaidarbha mārga* is special and the other *alaṁkaras* are common to both. These common, (*sādhāraṇa*) poetic figures are dealt with by Dandin in two chapters (ii and iii) devoted to respectively to the treatment of verbal (*śabda*) and ideal figures (*arthālaṁkāra*).

Dandin pays greater attention to *arthālamkāra*. He mentions by name (ii.4-7) only thirty five poetic figures but adds a large number

of subordinate varieties. For instance *upamā*, has thirty two subdivisions.

Dandin mentions 10 flaws or *doṣas* of literary compositions.

guṇas	*doṣas*
1. *śleṣa* 'qulity of being well knit'	1. *sithila* or looseness
2. *prasāda* or lucidity	2. *vyutpanna* or far-fetchedness
3. *samatā* or evenness (in the grouping of word sounds)	3. *vaiṣamya* or unevenness.
4. *mādhurya* or elegance	
5. *sukumārata* or absence of harshness due to the use of soft vocables.	4. *dīpta*.
6. *artha vyakti* or explicitness of sense.	5. *neyatva*
7. *udāratva* or elevation consisting of the expression of some high merit	--
8. *ojas* or force due to the presence of compounds	--
9. *kānti* or agreeableness due to conformity to general usage.	6. *atyukti*
10. *samādhi* or transference of the qualites or actions of one thing to another i.e. metaphorical expressions.	--

The of fault the *mādhurya* has not been named. In all he speaks of 10 *guṇas* but only 7 *doṣas*.

Vamana

Vāmana's work is divided into five *adhikaraṇas* each of which consists of two *adhyāyas* excepting the first and the fourth which contain three each. Thus the whole work contains five *adhikaraṇas* and twelve *adhyayas,*

I. *śarīra* dealing with the object of poetry, qualified persons to receive instructions in the subject, the *rīti* and its subdivision, the subsidiary aids and divisions of poetry . II. *doṣa darśana* treating of the defects or flaws of composition. III. *guṇa-vivecana* : Considering the *guṇas* or excellences of composition IV. *ālamkārika* devoted to the definition and illustration of poetic figures V. *prāyogika* : setting forth the poetic conventions and propriety of poetic usages and *śabba - śuddhi,* explaining grammatical solecism

Vāmana lays down in clear terms *rītir ātmā kāvyasya* (I 2.6) 'the *rīti* is the soul of poetry' and the word (*śabda*) and its meaning (*artha*) constitute the body, of which the soul is the *rīti* (*vṛtti* on I). He defines *rīti* as *viśiṣṭa padaracanā* or particular arrangement of words. He proposes three kinds of *rīti* viz., *vaidarbhī, gauḍī* and *pāñcālī.* The *Vaidarbhī* unites all the ten *guṇas*, the *gauḍī* abounds in *ojas* and *kānti* and the *pāñcāli* is endowed with *mādhurya* and *saukumārya*.

Like Dandin, Vāmana enumerates the *guṇas* as ten. The standard number from Bharaṭa's time. However, differentiates between *śabda-guṇa* and *arthaguṇa*. Each *guṇa* belonging to *śabda* and *artha* double the number into twenty.

His scheme of the *guṇas* may be tabulated as under.'

Śabdaguṇa	***Arthaguṇa***
i. *ojas* or compactness of word structure	i. *ojas* or maturity of conception.

ii.	*prasāda* or laxity of structure	ii.	*prasāda* or clearness of meaning
iii.	*śleṣa* or coalescence of words resulting in smoothness	iii.	*śleṣa* or coalescence or commingling of many ideas.
iv.	*samatā* or homogeneity of manner i.e. of construction	iv.	*samatā* or non relinquishment of proper sequence of ideas
v.	*samādhi* or symmetry due orderly ascent and dissent i.e. when the heightening effect is toned down by softening effect and vice versa.	v.	*samādhi* or grasping of the original meaning arising from concentrarion of the mind.
vi.	*mādhurya* or distinctness of words	vi.	*mādhurya* or strikingness of utterance.
vii.	*saukumārya* or freedom from harshness	vii.	*saukumārya* or freedom from disagreeable or inauspicious ideas.
viii.	*udāratā* or livelininess in which the words seem as if they are dancing	viii.	*udārata* or delicacy i.e. absence of vulgarity.
ix.	*artha vyakti* or explicitness of words where by the meaning is easily apprehended.	xi.	*artha vyakti* or explicitness of ideas which makes the nature of things clear.
x.	*kānti* or brilliance. i.e. richness of *rasa*.	x.	*kānti* or prominence of the words.

(De : 1925)

After the *guṇas*, Vāmana deals with the poetic figures or *alaṁkāras* as elements of subsidiary importance. He accepts *alaṁkāras* in the

broad and primary sense of beauty or charm. *(kāvyam grāhyam alaṁkārāt, saundaryam alaṁkārāh).* Vamana does not seem to consider the presence of *alaṁkāra* or poetic figures a necessary condition. What makes poetry beautiful and charming has not been stated clearly. The *rīti* and its constituent *guṇas* come in as a *sinequa non* in the production or beauty but the poetic figures only contribute its heightening. Vāmana is the only early writer who deals with the smallest number of poetic figures. i.e. 30 figures. He recognises only two kinds of *śabdalaṁ kāra*, viz., *yamaka* (rhythmic) and *anuprāsa* (allilīration), with regard to *arthālaṁkāra*, he is of the opinion that the *upamā* or comparison lies at the root of all poetic figures which are defined in relation to it and which is given the collective names of *upamā prapañca*.

The preceding paragraphs is a brief outline of the early representatives of *alaṁkarikas* not an exhaustive one. Many more rhetoricians appeared on the scene later and their names and works are listed already.

Dhvani or suggestion theory

The word *dhvani* can be derived from 1) *dhvanatīti dhvaniḥ* That which is suggested. (Both word and its meaning fall under this sense) 2) *dhvanyata* itī *dhvaniḥ* that which is suggested. Only sense comes under this category. 3) *dhvananam dhvani* The process of suggestion 4) *dhvani samudāyaḥ dhvaniḥ*. 'the whole work, comprising of these elements is *dhvani*. Thus, *dhavani* or suggestion requires, suggestive word, suggested sense ,the process of suggestion and the composition in which all these elements are persent.

Ānandavardhana was the propounder of the theory of suggestion or *dhvani* though he cannot be claimed the first one to propose this theory. Bharata's *vyañjana* also means the same theory. He openly admits that

he has taken this term directlv from the grammarian. i.e. Bhartrhari's *sphota*.

Dhvanyāloka consists of a *kārikā* and *vṛtti*. Anandavardhana's authorship of *kārikā* is still disputed. According to Krishnamurty the *karikas* also were written by none other than Ānanadavardhana. Abhinavagupta has written *locana* for *dhvanyāloka*.

Definition of dhavani

Yatrāthaḥ śabdo vā tamartham- upasarjanī kṛtasvārthau.
vyaṅktaḥ kāvya viśeṣaḥ sa dhvani riti sūribhiḥkathitaḥ

'Learned men regard that variety of composition to be *dhvani* where in the expressed sense subordinating itself or expressive words subornating their expressed sense suggest that sweet and beautiful idea. i.e. *dhvani* poetry is that type of poetry in which the literal meaning keep themselves snbordinate to the suggested meaning which is more important. i.e. prominent. In *Dhvanyālaka*, Ānanadavardhana establishes that suggestion is the soul of poetry. *Kāvyasyātmā dhvaniḥ* (I.1.)

dhavni or suggested meaning is divided into three major categories : 1) suggestion of an idea *(vastudhvani)* 2) suggestion of a figure *(alaṁkāradhvani)*, and 3) suggestion of a *rasa* or sentiment.

Vastudhvani

eg. *bhrama dhammia so suṇa o*
ajja māri o tena
golāṇaī kaccha kuḍaṅga vāsiṇā
dari asiheṇa.
bhrama dhārmika viś vastaḥ sa
śunako'dya māritastena.
godānadī kūla latā kuñjavāsinā dṛptasimhena. ||

Ramble freely pious man !
That dog today is killed
By the fierce lion that dwells
In Godā river dells.

In this type of *dhvani* sometimes the implicit meaning will be of the nature of prohibition when the explicit is of the nature of positive proposal. The above verse is an illustration. Sometimes though the explicit meaning is of the nature of a prohibition, the implicit will be of the positive nature. eg.

attā ettha ṇimajjai
ettha aham diasam pahehi
mā pahia rattiandha a sejjae maha ṇimajjahisi .
śvaśrūratra nimajjati atrāham divasakam pralokaya.
mā pathika rātryandhaka śayyāyām āvayor maṅkṣih |.

Mother-in-law lies here lost in sleep,
And I here, thou sheuldst mark.
These before it is dark.
O traveller, blinded by right
Tumble not into our heds *aright.*

alaṁkāradhvani

lāvaṇya kānti paripūrita diṅ mukhe's min
smere' dhunā tava mukhe taralāyatākṣi
kṣobham yad eti na manāgapi tena manye.
'suvyaktam eva jaḍarāsis ayam payodhiḥ ||

Lit up the quarters with your lustrous beauty,
And your face looks charming with a smile on it.
And still, O darling if the ocean does not sweil.
Obviously it is a mass of inertness.

Though the idea of moon face is not directly stated, it is clearly suggested. It is only when the mataphar that the lady's lovely face is identical with the moon is understood, the passage will becone fully meaningful. Much of the beauty in the passage is due to this *rūpakā laṁkāra dhvani*. And this figure is not at all to be discovered in the explicit sense.

rasadhvani

The incident which led to the composition of the first poet Vālmīkī, viz. *Rāmayaṇa* can be cited as an example.

> *Kavyasyātmā sa evarthas tatha cādikaveḥ purā* |.
> *krauñcadvandva viyogotthaḥ śokaḥ ślokatvam āgataḥ* ||.

The reference here is to the verse in the Ramayana.

> *mā niṣāda pratiṣṭhām tvamagamaḥ śasvatī samāḥ*
> *yatkrauñca mithunād ekam avadhīḥ kāmamohitam* ||

Strictly speaking, *dhvani* theory is only an extension of *rasa* theory propounded by the author of *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Bharata defines *rasa* in connection with the dramaturgy and Ānandavardhana extends, this theory to poetry also. Suggestion by itself, is not enough in a compostion whether a drama or poetry, what is suggeted must be charming and this charm can be got only through *rasa* or sentiment. *Rasa* is not a thing which can be expressed directly by words it can only be suggested. Ānandavardhana establishes that *rasādi* variety is the soul of poetry. In *kāvyasyātmā* the first part says that very *rasādi* variety is the soul of *kāvya, kāvyasyātmā sa evārthaḥ* and the 2nd part the sorrow of the first poet caused by the seperation of the curlew couple took the form of a verse. *(ādikaveḥ purā krauncadvandva- viyogataḥ śokaḥ ślokatvam āgataḥ)*

Varieties of dhvani

Suggesion or *dhvani* may be further classified as 1) *avivakṣitavācya* or *lakṣaṇā mūla* and 2) *vivakṣitānya paravācya*.

1) *Avivakṣitavācya*

In this type of *dhvani* the expressed meaning is either completely set aside *(atyanta tiraskṛta)* or it is shifted or used with a slightly different emphasis *(arthantarasaṅkaramita)*

eg.

ravi saṅkrānta saubhāgyas tuṣarāvṛta maṇḍalaḥ
nisvāsandha ivādarśas candramā na prakāśate ||.

All the charm to the sun hath fled,
And the orb is hid in snow;
Like a mirror by breath blinded
The moon now does not glow.

The meaning blinded *(andha)*, the explicit sense is to be discarded as here.

arthātarasaṅkramita

Smigdhaś yāmala kāntī kliptaviyato vellād valākā ghanā
Vātāh śīkariṇāḥ payoda suhṛd ām ānandakekāḥ kalāḥ
Kāmam santu dṛḍham kaṭhora hṛdayo rāmo'smi sarvam sahe
Vaidehi tu katham bhaviṣyati haha hā devi dhīrā bhava ||.

The word *rāma* in this example carries the suggestive force. The word does not merely denote an individual with that proper name but conveys the sense of a person endowed with various qualities by the force of suggestion.

2) *vivakṣitavācyakrama*

In this type the expressed sense is intended but it subserves a further implied sense, is again divided into :

1) asamlakṣya krama and 2) samlakṣya krama.

vivaksitānya paravācyadhvani

eg. *śikharini kva nu nāma kiyac ciram*
kim abhidhānam asāvakarottapaḥ
taruṇi yena tavādhara pāṭalam
daśatī bimba phalam śukasāvakaḥ

On which mountain and for how long
Did this one perform penance ?
And what might be its name?
For, the young parrot pecks
The fruit so real as your lips

Here a young lover says this in the presence of his beloved. All that young lover says is the expressed meaning but this expressed meaning suggest the idea that the speaker is praising his beloved *(nāyikā)* so that she may be attracted towords her admirer.

1) *asamlakṣya krama vyaṅgya.*

Here, the suggested sense *(vyaṅgya)* is said to be realised after the expressed sense *(vācya)* without any noticeable sequence. e.g.

cañcad bhuja bhramita caṇḍagadābhighāta
sañcūrnitoru yugalasya suyodhanasya
styānāvabaddhaghana śoṇita śoṇapāṇi
ruttaṁsayiṣyati kacāṁstava devi bhīmaḥ |

O Queen! this Bhīma shall himself bind
your dishevelled hair with his hands
Reddened by the profuse and coagulated puddles
of Suyodhana's blood as he lies low with thighs
pulverised by hard blows
From this terrible mace.
Swung by these redoubtable arms of mine.

This verse is from the *Venisamhāra*. The reader, here, is supposed to be instantaneously infused with the feeling of anger *(Krodha)*, while reading the verse through an identification of himself with the dramatic character i.e. Bhīmasena. This identification produced is none other than a sentence adorned by lengthy compound construction. All the process of identification, experience of a permanent mental state and the relish of the exquisite joy runs very rapidly.

2) samlakṣya krama vyaṅgya

In this type of suggestion, we pass on from the expressly conveyed idea to the suggested idea through a noticeable sequence, as in the verse *śikhariṇi....* cited above.

This type of *dhvani* is said to be of three types *1) śabdaśaktyudbhava 2) arthśaktyudbhava and 3) śabhārthaśaktyudbhava*

1) *śabdśaktyudbhava :* That which in bassed on the word.

This type of *dhvani* is based on the capacity of the words because, the suggested sense is dependant on the use of words capable of conveying two primary meaning at a time although the primary meaning also contribute to the suggested sense. In this type of *dhvani* homonyms are used and the figure is *śleṣa* or *double entendre e.g.*

tasyā vināpi hāreṇa nisargādeva hāriṇau
janayāmāsatuḥ kasya vismayam no payodharam.

Her bosoms without a garland though.
Garlanded (also ravishing) by nature were,
Whom would they not amaze!

Here, the word *hāriṇau* is a homonym having double meaning *(ślesa)* ie. attractive and having (wearing) a necklace. Connecting the second meaning i.e. having a '*hāra*' with *vināpi hāreṇa*, we have the figure *virodhābhasa* on account of the *śleṣa*.

2) *arthaśaktyudhava* :That which is based on the meaning

evam vādini devarṣau pitur pārśver adhomukhī |
līlā kamala patrāṇi gaṇayāmāsa parvatī ||.

As the divine sage said this
The down-cast Parvati, by her father's side
counted the petals of the toy-lotus
She held in her hand.

Here the idea of counting lotus petals is conveyed expressly and the expressed sense subjugates itself in communicating the second idea, namely, bashfulness. One of the passing moods *(vyabhi cāribhāva)* without laking the assistance of the denotative words at all.

3) *śabdārthaśaktyudbhava* : That which is based on both the word and the meaning.

No exmaple of this type is given by Ānandavardhana. However, from his *kārika, śabda śaktyārthaśaktyā vākṣitopi vyaṅgyo' rthaḥ* .... one can infer that Ānanadavardhana postulates this type of *dhvani* as well.

□□□

IV. Literary Criticism in Tamil and Sanskrit Traditions (A comparison)

The need for a compartive study

There are certain concepts connected with the theory of drama or poetry on which one finds some similarities. There are, no doubt, a number of points on which there is divergence of opinion. Similarites in certain concepts have led a number of scholars to arrive at a conclusion that Tamil theories particularly *rasa* or sentiment, *upamā* or simile and suggestion proposed by Tolkappiyar are due to the influence of Sanskri theories. Some scholars argue that Tolkappiyar makes an attempt to introduce the theory of *meyppāṭū* and *uvamai* of Sanskrit tradition with a view to gain acceptability outside Tamilakam. There are other scholars who think the portions dealing with these topics are later interpolations as they do not fit into the scheme of poetry as proposed by Tolkāppiyar. Such views lead, in turn, another important question, whether Tolkāppiyar's method of treatment of these theories is really similar to that of Sanskrit tradition. In order to answer this question, we have to address ourselves. 1) The relative chronology of *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatīkāram* and Bharata's *Nātṣyaśāstra*. 2) A comparison of the treatment of literary themes in both the tradition, and 3) A comparison of the treatment of literary theories such as sentiment etc. We may be in a position to say whether or not there is influence of one on the other when we have a clear picture about these points.

Let us take up the second and third points before we tackle the first one. It is essential to know at the outset, the concept of poetry as discussed in each of the tradition. As already stated, Sanskrit literary theories were written after analysing a number of Sanskrit texts which existed earlier. Tamil tradition has only *Tolkāppiyam-Poruḷatikārm* the earliest extant work as the representative. Here again, scholars have expressed divergent views regarding the relative chronology of *Tolkāppiyam* and the Caṅkam texts. It is not the intention of the author to enter into any such controversy nor it is required for this approach. Hence, this study is restricted to *Tolkāppiyam- Poruḷatīkāram* assuming that it is the earlist representative of literary themes and theories.

Definition of Poetry in Tamil

Tolkāppiyar does not attempt a proper definition, as such, of a poetry. However he informs us what are the essentials of a poetry in the *Poruḷatīkāram* of *Tolkāppiyam*.

He uses three words referring to poetry in *Tolkāppiyam* as a whole. They are :*1) ceyyuḷ 2) pā* and *3) pulaṉerivaḻakku*. *Ceyyuḷ* means that which has been created (from the root *cey*' to make, to create). A number of sutras in *Tolkāppiyam* gives us the impression that he makes use of the word *ceyyuḷ* or composed or written form opposite to *vaḻakku* or common usage. We can give a few sturas from *Tolkāppiyam* as illustration

nīṭa varutal ceyyuḷuḷ uritte (T E. 7.6)

'iṉṟi' eṉṉum viṉai eñcu iṟuti

niṉṟa ikaram ukaram ātal

toṉṟu iyal maruṅ kiṉ ceyyuḷuḷ uritte (TE. 7.35)

iṉacuṭṭu illāp paṇpu koḷ peyark koṭai

vaḻakku āru alla ceyyul urittē (TC. 1. 18)
ākkak kiḷavi kāraṇam iṉṟiyum
'pōkku iṉṟu' iṉpa - vaḻakkiṉuḷḷe (TC,1.22)
murpaṭal kiḷattal ceyyuḷuḷ uritte (TC. 1. 39)
palavayiṉāṉum eṇṇut tiṇai viravuppeyar
aḵṟṇai mūṭipiṉa ceyyuliḷḷē (TC. 1. 51)
peyariṉum toḻiliṉum piripavai ellām
mayaṅkal kūṭā vaḻakku vaḷippaṭṭaṉa (TC. 1. 50)
iraiccip poruḷ vayiṉ ceyyuḷuḷ kilakkum
yāṟpeyar k kiḷavi uyartiṇai cuttā
nilattu valli maruṅkiṉ tōṉṟalā ṉa (TC 5. 42)
pāl ari marapiṉ ammū īṟṟum
ā ō ākum ceyyuḷ uḷḷē (TC, 6. 14)
iyaṟcol, tirical, ticaiccd., vaṭacol eṉṟu
anaittē - ceyuḷ īṭṭac colle (YC 9.1)

These sutras reflect the existence of diglossia situation, ie. written dialect and spoken dialect. He seems to accept the spoken variety of the people of upper strata of the society as the standard one.

vaḻakku eṉ appaṭuvatu uyarnōr mēṟṟē (TC .9.94)

He, also states that a particular word is found in the usage of *uyarntōr*, it should be acceptable in the *ceyyuḷ* as well.

uyarntōr kiḷavi vaḻakkoṭu puṇartaliṉ
vaḻakku vaḻippaṭutal ceyyuṭkuk kaṭaṉē (TC. 5.21)

Thus Tolkāppiyar speaks of dialect variation of *ceyyuḷ* and *vaḻakku* and the latter is the usage of the people belonging to upper class society.

Tolkāppiyar treats of *ceyyaḷ* in an eleborate and expansive manner. The opening verse of *Ceyyaḷ iyal* lists 34 elements as the

components of poetry. They are : *māttirai*, *eluttu*, *acai*, *cīr*, *ati*, *yāppu*, *marapu*, *tūkku*, *totai*, *nōkku*, *pā*, *alavu*, *tinai*, *kaikōl*, *kūrru*, *kētpōr*, *kalan*, *kālam*, *payan*, *meyppātu*, *eccam*, *munnam*, *porul*, *turai*, *māttu*, *vannam*, *ammai*, *alaku*, *tonmai*, *tōl*, *viruntu*, *iyaipu*, *pulan*, *ilaipu*.

He futher classifies *pā* or *pāttu* as *venpā*, *āciriuappā*, and so on. *Pāttu* should comprise of the following elements ; *tinai*, *kaikol*, *kūrru*, *marapu*, *kētpōr*, *kalan*, *kālam*, *payan*, *meyppātu*, *eccam*, *porul*, *munnam*, *turai*, *māttu* and *vannam*. He then defines and subdivides such as *tinai* having subdivisions as *kuriñci*, *mullai* and so no. (See supra for further details)

Tokappiyar classifies literature into seven types in the *Ceyyuliyal*. They are 1) *pāttu* (poetry), 2) *urai* (commentary), 3) *nūl* (treatise) 4) *vāymoli* (oral literature) 5) *pici* (riddle), 6) *aṅkatam* (abusive poem) and 7) *mutucal* (proverb) (TP). He also speaks about the *mutalnūl* (original) and *valinūl* (translated work)

Thus, according to Tolkāppriyar, a composition should consist of two main theme *akam* or *puram* which in turn should contain all those items listed under each one of them.

Definition of poetry in Sanskrit

The problem of definition engaged the minds of the Sanskrit critics in a most serious way. It was customary for every manual of poetics to begin with a chapter on the nature of literature and then to proceed to an analysis of its constituent elements. More over, poetics in the Sanskrit tradition was considered as a scientific discipline (*śāstra)*. Therefore, it must avoid the fault of *avyāpti* and *ativyāpti* ie. not excluding those elements which should be covered and not including those elements which are not to be covered.

Definition of poetry by the Sanskrit theorists may be considered under *alaṁkaṛa* or embellishment school, *rīti* school, *dhvani* or suggestion school, and *rasa* school.

Aḷaṁkāra school

The dhvani school critics-Bhāmaha, Udbhata, Rudraṭa and Dandin are chiefly rhetoricians who are intersted in analysing, defining and classifying the poetic figures.

alaṁkaras. The *ālaṁkarikas* or Sanskrit theories, generally speak of *kāvyasarira or* the body of poetry and *kāvyātmā* or the soul of poetry on the analogy of Vedic *puruṣa*. In accordance with this principle, the poetic language is analysed into word (*śabda*) and sense (*artha*). Thus Bhāmaha defines a poetry as word and its meaning constitute the poetic body. (*śabdārthau sahitau kāuyam.*)

Dandin defines the body of poetry as a sequence of words conveying the desired sense of a poet. (*śarīram tāvadiṣṭārtha vyavacchinnā padāvali*). The poetic figure or *alaṁkāra* is defined as all attributes adding to beauty and charm to the poetry go by the name *alaṁkāra*. *kāvyaśobhākarān dharmān alaṁkāran pracakṣate*).

The early theorists stress the importance of *alaṁkāra* or poetic figure in a poetry. Dandin, however, considers *guṇa* to be the essential element of a peotry . It should be noted that none of the followers of *alaṁkara* school ever called *alaṁkāra* as the soul of poetry.

Vāmana, the chief and the first exponent of the theory of *rīti* or style speaks of the soul of poetry. He considers *rīti* as the soul of poetry, *rītir ātmā kāvyasya* (Kvs. 1.2.6). He defines *rīti* as the arrangement of words in a specific manner in a poetry (*viśiṣta padaracanāḥ ritiḥ KVS.* 1. 2. 7) *Guṇas* are the elements which add charm to the poetry (*kāvya śobhāyāḥ kartāro dharmāḥ guṅāḥ* (3.1.1). According to him *guṅas* are the essential cause of charm in poetry. *Kāvya* is appreciated because of

embellishment and embellishment is another name for charm. *kāvyam grāhyam alaṁkarāt* (1.1.1) *saundaryam alaṁkāraḥ*). What Vāmana refers to by the term *rīti* is called as *mārga* by Dandin.

Kuntaka tries to show that deviancy (*vakrokti*) accounts for poetic charm. He subsumes the principle of figuration (*alamkaras*) itself under the larger operations of deviant speech (*vakrokti*). He concedes that an embellished form of expression deserves the designation of poetry (*sālaṁkārasya kāvyatā* (*Vakrokti jivita* 1.6.). But he stresses that all these embellishments are but the constituents of deviant speech which is the common charactiristic of all poetic embellishments.

Dhvani school

Dhavni or suggestion theory propounded by Ānandavardhana gives a new dimension to the problem of definition of poetry. In the *Dhvanyāloka*, Ānandavardhana tries to establish that the suggestion is the soul of poetry (*kāvyasyātmā dhvaniḥ*). (Dhv. P. 2). He says that beautiful ideas in poetry are of two kinds, viz. 1) literal (*vācya*) and 2. implied (*pratiyamāna*) and the latter (suggested) sense is the most important element in poetry. Strictly speaking, the theory of suggestion is only an extension of the *rasa* theory. What is suggested in drama or poetry should also be charming and this charm can come only through *rasa*.

Rasa theory

Bharata, the first systematic writer on poetics, does not attempt a definition of poetry. He enumerates and analysise various elements such as *rasa*, diction, figures, metrical patterns, styles and so on which constitute a dramatic poetry. However he does assert that *rasa* is the most vital element in the poetry. He says no poetic meaning subsists without *rasa* (*na hi rasād rte kaścid arthaḥ pravartate* (NS. VI.)

Abhinavagupta says that *rasa* is the fundamental aim and purport of poetry (*tatkāvyārtho rasaḥ* Abhinavabharati. NS. 6. p. 652) *kīvyasyārthāḥ rasāḥ* t.p. 786). He asserts the importance of *rasa* by saying ' there is no poetry that is devoid of *rasa*...... poetry lives by *rasa* alone. (*na hi tacchūnyam* kāvtam *kimcid asti..... rasenaiṣa sarvam jīvati kāvyam. Locana Dhvanyāḷoka* 2.3p. 79) Ānandavardhana too says where *rasa* in its various forms, is not the subject matter of discourse, there is no manner of poetry is possible (*yatra tu rasādīnām aviṣayatvam sa kāvyaprakāro na sambhavaty eva. Dhva* 3.43)

Thus, one can notice the similarity of approach between Tolkappiyar and Bharata, the earliest and first systematic writer on poetics in Sanskrit. Similarity of approaches in their treatment is very clear in that both discuss about the essential elements that constitute a poetry. Incidentally Bharata does not distinguish between a drama and a poetry. Later theorists in Sanskrit include drama in the *miśra kāvya* i.e. a mixture of verse and prose though drama falls under the *dṛśya* of *prekṣaṇīya kāvya* one of the two major divisions of *kāvya*. Chronologically also they appear to have lived more or less at the same period. The later theorists in Sanskrit are undoubtelly posterior to Tolkāppiyar.

Comparison of literary themes

Formulation of literary theories in Sanskrit is based on the texts writtern earlier, in other words literary texts preceded the rise of literary theories in Sanskrit. Origin of poetry can be traced back to Rgvedic period. Unfortuṇately, we are left with only one text viz., *Tolkāppiyam* in Tamil as the literary composition anterior to *Tolkāppiyam* is said to have lost. As *Tolkāppiyam* covers both literary theme or literary theories, this text forms the basis for any study whether the literary theme or literary theories. Cankam classics are believed to

have been written later, than *Tolkappiyam*. Following the principles laid down by Tolkappiyar.

We don't find much similarity between the Tamil and Sanskrit tradition as can be observed from the account sketched in the preceding pages; main differnce between the two traditions under review is the concept of *tinai*. Tamil literary texts are written within the framework of *tinai* as prescribed by Tolkāppiyar.

However, one cannot totally ignore certain topics shared by both the traditions though *tinai* concept is altogether absent in the Sanskrit tradition. Sanskrit literary text also treat of poems dealing with the love of the hero, his war expedation and so on and so forth. If such topics are not dealt with by Sanskrit writers, there is no meaning in the enumeration of *rasas* as eight (by Bharata) which includes, *raudra* and *vīra* bravery and heroism.

Whereas Tolkāppiyar treats of the love poems in the context of *akam* theme and heroism etc in the context of *puram* theme. Sanskrit poets do not observe such strict demarcation between a hero's love aspect and his heroism. Tolkāppiyar strictly prohibits the mention of the proper names of *akam* characters, Sanskrit poets invariably mention the name of characters, as Duṣyanta, Śakuntala and so on, irrespective of the theme they are writing on. Kalidāśaś Meghasandeśa a lyrical poem is one of the very few poems in which the hero's name has not been mentioned Kalidāsa simply states *kaścid yakṣaḥ* 'certain yakṣ'a

Love poem is a favourite theme of both Tamil and Sanskrit poets and so we may take this topic commanly found in both the tradition and see how they treat this topic. Though the topic of love is shared by both the tradition, their method of treatment appears to be different.

Tamil tradition treats of love between the hero and the heroine in two stages as *kaḷavu* and *kaṟpu* and each stage is said to have been associated with different steps. *kaḷavu* stage deals with the pre-marital relationship,

the lovers' clandestine meeting, various characters associated with the main characters, and so on and so forth. *Kaḷavu* stage culminates in the open wedding with the consent of the elders. If the lovers do not succeed in getting their approval they have the option of elopement. Tamil tradition appears to be advocating monogamy. *Kaṟpu* stage begins after their marriage. Their wedding itself is termed *kārpumaṇam*. Different stages associated with the love situation in both the stages are described. All the love situation are described as belonging to one or the other *tiṇai* with their associated *mutal, uri* and *karupprul*.

Sanskrit poets, too consider the *rasa*, called *śṛṅgāra* or love as the king of *rasa (rasarājaḥ)* as such several works delineate *śṛṅgāra* as the predominant sentiment. However, the stages of *kaḷavu* and *kāṟpu* step by step procedure up to the final stage of their love, their description within the framework of *tiṇai* are althogether absent in Sanskrit poems.

There are certain common topics dealt with by the Tamil and Sanskrit poets, despite the differences in their method of description. The topic of a love situation viz., separation is particularly interesting. Let us compare the treatment in both the tradition to show, their approaches to this commonly shared aspect.

Tolkāppiyar lists a number of reasons for the separation of lovers. however, Sanskrit tradition is silent on this i.e. listing of the causes though a number of poems depicts the pang of separation between the lovers. Sanskrit tradition speaks of two stages viz, *sambhoga* or union and *vipralambha* or separation; the former stage is found described only in a very few poems as in the *Kumārasambhava* of Kalidāsa but the latter, viz, *vipralambha śṛṅgāra* or love in separation is described in almost all the *śṛṅgāra* or love dominated *kāvya*. *Vipralambha śṛṅgāra* is classifeid into two major types as *yoga-vipralambha* and *ayoga vipralanbha*. In *yoga-vipralambha* the lovers invariably get united i.e. they have hope of final union. But *ayogavipralambha* is concerned with such situation

in which there is no hope of reunion. i.e. one of the lovers meet with their end as found in the lamentation of Rati (*ratīvilāpa*) after the death of Manmatha in the *Kumārasambhava* and the lamentation of Aja. (*aja vilāpa*) after the death of his wife Indumatī in Kalidasa's *Raghuvaṁs'a*

Yogavipralambha can be classified as *māna* and *pravāsa* respectively due to anger or pride, and exile. Separation due to exile has been described beautifully by Kālidasa in his *Meghasandeśa*. The reasons for the separation of *yakṣa* from his beloved said to be the curse in the *Meghasandeśa*. Again in the *Vikramorvaśiyam* the curse is said to be the cause for separation of the king Vikrama and his beloved divine nymph Ūrvasī. Rumour (*kim vadanti*) of people was the cause for separation between Rama and Sita in the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūtī.

Vipralambha śṛṅgara is interpreted as the infidelity of the husband by some western scholars. This interpretation cannot fit well into Sanskrit tradition when we study the Sanskrit poems. Polygamy was an accepted norm, and nowhere it is said that the other wives of the king complain about her husband's marrying several wives. In fact, the words *rājānaḥ bahuvallabhāh* or the kings have many wives is put into the mouth of one of the wives. Therefore in the context of love in separation the word *vipralambha* cannot be rendered as faithlessness as the westerners would like to believe

Of course, there is no denial of the fact that there was rivalry amongest the hero's wives. Even when there is rivalry, as in the case of the chief queen *Dhārini* and the younger wife Iravatī of the king Agnimitra towards his newly found love *Mālavīkā* in the *Mālavikāgnitra* of Kalidasa, the king marries Mālavikā only after settling the score with his chief queen Dhāriṇi. In fact, it is his chief queen Dhāriṇi who decorates Mālavikā for her wedding with Agnimitra.

Tolkāppiyar's list includes the separation due to his contact with prostitute. Here again Sanskrit tradition differs from the Tamil tradition. Sanskrit poets do not pay much importance to such affairs of the hero nor his wife considers it as an act of unfaithfulness on the part of her husband. A case in point is Carudatta's relationship with Vasantasena, (a courtezan.) in the *Mrcchaaṭikam*. Carudatta's wedded wife, herself receives Vasantasena happily.

Depiction of separation suffered by the lovers is generally put in the words of the female character i.e. heroine in the Tamil tradition whereas it is the male characters who express the pangs of separation in the Sanskrit tradition as for instance, *yakṣa* describes the condition of his beloved in separation. Rama expresses the grief of separation from Sita in the *Rāmāyaṇa* as well as the *Uttararāma carita*.

Thus, we can notice, that Tamil tradition has its own method of dealing with the poetic theme entirely different from that of Sanskrit tradition though there are certain shared topics. Tamil tradition is unique in introducing *tiṇai* concept in dealing with the literary theme and is totally absent in all the other traditions.

Comparison of literary theories

The *Tolkāppiyam*, as well as Sanskrit *alaṁkāra śāstra* speak of poetic figuration, sentiment and suggestion. Some scholars are of the opinion that the figure of speach *upamā* (Skt) and sentiment or *rasa* are introduced in *Tolkāppiyam* on Sanskrit model and their treatment in *Tolkāppiyam* is alien to Tamil tradition. Some scholars go to the extent of suggesting the sections *Uvamaiyiyal* and *Meyppāṭṭiyal* are later interpolation following Sanskrit pattern. It is not intended to enter into any kind of argument either in favour or against these views. An attempt is made here

to present these topics as described in these two traditions and compare their approaches.

Simile in *Tolkāppiyam*

Uvamai corresponds to Sanskrit *upamā*. In Sanskrit the term *upamāna* and *upameya* are used whereas Tolkappiyam uses the terms *uvamam* and *poruḷ*. *uvamam*, according to Tolkappiyar falls into two major divisions, viz. *uḷḷuṟal uvamam* or implicit simile and *ēṉai uvamam* or explicit simile. Let us consider first the explicit simile. (*ēṉai uvamam*). He dicusses the explicit simile in the section called *Uvama iyal*. He defines *uvamai*, the classification of *uvamam* on the basis of action etc. comparative particles, that a poet should make use of in comparison, different types of *uvamai* and appearance of *uvamai* made on the basis superiority and inferiority in the eight *meyppāṭus* enumerated in the preceding section and so on.

Both Sanskrit and Tamil tradition share the view that the constituents of comparison are *upamāna*, *upameya* and also a comparative particle, Tolkāppiyar restricts to only one figure viz. *uvamai*.

Tolkāppiyar does not explain the place of simile in a literature though he has devoted one full section for simile. Absence of such explanation, has led to many speculations, Sanskrit writers on poetics, clearly have stated that *alaṁkāra* is an embellishment to poetry. Starting from Bharata almost all rhetoricians agree that *alaṁkaras* add to the beauty of poetry. We had already stated that the rhetorician in Sanskrit view a poetic composition having a body and (*kāvyaśarīra*) and a soul. (*kāvyātymā*). Importance of *alamkāra* in a poetry has been recognized, even after Dhvani theory eclipsed all the other systems of poetry. Ānandavardhana includes *alaṁkāra dhvani* as one of the sub divisions of Dhvani.

Tolkāppiyam enumesrates the constituents of a poetry in the opening verse of *Ceyyuliyal*. whereas he includes *meyppātū* in the list, *ani* or ornament correspondingto (*alaṁkāra*) has not been included. This raises a question as to whether or not Tolkāppiyar considers *aṇi* as an embelliment to a poetry. If he does not why should he include a section on *uvamai* in Tolkāppiyam covering various aspects of it. His sutras are of no help in arriving at a conclusion.

According to Ilampūraṇar, simile serves two purposes. 1) It makes clear what is not known earlier. For example if, it is said *ā polum āmā* 'wild cow is like domesticated cows', a person who has not scen earlier *āmā* (wild cow) if he comes across a wild cow (*ā mā*) in a forest, he will understand what *āmā* is.

The second purpose, according to *Iḷampuraṇar* is it becomes an *alaṁkara*. i.e. an *aṇi* or ornament to poetry. Thus it adds to the beauty and charm of poetry.

Peraciriyar disagrees with Ilampuraṇar. He is of the opinion that a simile cannot be an *alaṁkāra* to a poetry simply because one cannot name any principle as ornament to poetry. If the poet is skilled he will make any principle to be the ornament of his poetry. If the same principle is handled by unskilled poets, it cannot become ornament. It is actually the skill and the experience of a poet that makes a poem charming. Another objection, Peraciriyar raises against considering *uvamai* as *aṇi* is that there are many other elements which adds to the poetry charm and beauty, why should one single out only *uvamai* as ornament. He raises another point, that is if simile is considered as an ornament of poetry, then it becomes an external element to poetry. But, *uvamai* is not external to poetry. It is an integral part of poetry. Therefore only *uvamai* is held as ornament of poetry excluding all the other elements then it will fall into a flaw i.e. *kuṉṟakkūral* (avypti) (s. 663) (Peraciriyas's commentary the final part of the sutra. 312)

Some modern scholars also are of the opinion that Tolkappiayar does not view any element of poetry which includes *uvamai* as well as an ornament to poetry (Tamiḻaṇṇal 1985).

Now another question relating to *uvamai* arises in our mind is that why only *uvamai* or simile is included by Tolkāppiyar, and not other figures. Our answer is that *uvamai* forms the basis for other theories as the suggestion (*uḷḷuṟai uvamam and iṟaicci*) and hence it is important. Sanskrit *ālamkārikas* also were aware of the importance of *upamā* To quote De. 'The importance of *upamā* involved in other figures is recognised from Bhāmaha's time and consequently this figure which is the source of all figures grouped together by later writers as *sādṛśya-mūla* or *aupamya-garbha alaṁkāras* always given a place of honour at the beginning of most treatises on Sanskrit poetics" (*Upamaivāneka - prakāra vaicitryenālaṁkra - bījabhūtam prathamam Rāirdiṣṭā*. Ruyyakạ p. 26; *sādṛśya vicchitti viṣesya rūpaka dipakādy anekālaṁkāra bījat a yopamāyāḥ prathamam nirupaṇam*. *Malli natha*. p/ 195)

Simile in Sanskri tradition

Bharata states 36 characteristic features of a *kavya*. *kāvyalakṣaṇa* (17). He says there are four *alaṁkaṟas* or poetic figures viz., 1) *upamā* (simile), 2) *dīpaka* (illumination through condensed expression) 3) *rūpaka* (metaphor), and 4) *yamaka* (allteration)

1) *Upamā* or comparison. One object is compared to another in view of some resemblance in regards to quality or form. This comparison may be 1) of one with another one, 2) of one with many 3) of many with one and 4) of many with many. eg. a) your face is like the moon b) The luminaries shine like the moon, c) He has an eye like that of a vulture, peacock and hawk d) The elephants are like the clouds.

Bharata classifies *upamā* into 5 types. They are 1) *praśamśā* (praise) 2) *nindā* (censure) 3) *kalpita* (conceit) 4) *sādṛsī* (similarity) and 5) *kīñcit sādṛśī* (partial likeness).

2) *Dīpaka* : Throwing light on some idea. eg. In that region the following are caused not to be devoid of these, viz., The lakes are not devoid of swans, the trees are not devoid of flowers, the lotuses not devoid of inebriated bees, the gardens and parks not devoid of friendly groups of people.

3) *Rūpaka* metaphor : e.g. They have lotuses as for their faces, lilies for smiles, the full blown blue lotuses for the beautiful eyes; when flocks of swans begins to chirp, the pools resembling women appear to shine like talking to one another.

4) *Yamaka* Repetition of sounds and syllables at the beginning, middle or at the and of a feet and also at other places.

Bharata classifies *yamaka* into ten types : a) *Padānta*, b)*Kāñci* c) *Samudga*. d) *Vikrānta*, e) *Cakravāla*, f) *Sandaṣṭa*, g) *Pādadi*, h) *Amreḍita* i) *Caturvyavasita* j) *Māla*.

Illustration

a) *Padānta yamaka :* at the end of the feet

dinakṣyāt samhṛta raśmi maṇḍalam
divīva lagnam tapanīya maṇḍalam
vidhāti tāmram divi sūrya maṇḍalam
yathā taruṇyāḥ stana bhāra maṇḍalam.

As the close of the day the copper hued orb of the sun with the cluster of rays drawm in shines like a golden disc in the heavens and looks like the heavy bosom of a young maiden.

b) *Kāñci yamakam :* Both at the beginning and at the end of every foot there shall be two similar words e.g.

maya maya candra vatinām dravatīnām
vyaktāvyakta sarajanīṉām ajanī nām
phulle phulle sabharamare vā bhrama vā
rāmā rāmā vismayateca smayateca.

The watches of the night full of moonlight pass swiftly in the company of young women. They are some times noticed and some times not. Flowers have blossned whether they have been or not the fair lady looks at them admiringly and the park smiles with thier beauty.

c) *Samudga yamaka* : If half of the verse is repeated (with difference in meaning) it is an instance of *samudgayamaka*. Thus,

ketakī kusuma pāṇḍura dantaḥ
śobhate pravarakānana hastī
ketakī kusuma pāṇduradantaḥ
śobhate pravarakānana hastī.

The lofty forest elephant with its tusks grey and pale like *Ketakī* flowers appear splendid. The elephant like large forest appears splendid with *ketakī* flowers constituting its pale while tusks.

d) *Vikrānta yamaka* : If two feet are similar leaving a feet in the middle it is known as *vikrānta yamaka e.g.*

sa pūrvam vārano bhūtvā dviśṛinga iva parvataḥ
abhavad danta vaikalyād viśṛṅga iva parvataḥ

Having been like a mountain with two peaks formerly that elephant has become like a mountain with no peak since the tusks were impaired.

e) *Cakravāla yamaka* : If the word or syllable at the end of a foot is repeated at the beginning of the next foot it is an example of the *cakravāla yamaka* eg.

śaraistathā śatru bhirāhatā hatā
hatāśca bhū yastavānupuṅkhagaiḥ
khagaiśca sarvair yudhi śañ citāścitaś
citābhirūḍhā nihātas talais talaiḥ.

They were killed by the enemies with their arrows and they were struck again by the birds closely following the tail end of the missiles; the battle field was overspread with such birds by which dead bodies placed on the funeral pyre were pounced upon with their sharp feet.

f) *Sandaṣṭa yamaka* : When two words at the beginning of every foot are similar it is an example of *sandaṣṭa yamaka*.

paśya paśya ramaṇasya me guṇān
yena yena vaśagam karoti mām
yena yena hi māmaiti darśanam
tena tena vaśagam karoti mām

See see the good qualities of my lover by which he puts me under his control and he entices me with those qualities with which becomes my vision.

g) *Padāti yamaka* : When the same word occurs at the beginnings of all the feet it is an example of *pādādi yamaka* eg.

viṣṇuḥ sṛjāti bhūtāni viṣṇuḥ samharati prajāḥ
viṣṇuḥ prasūte trailokyam viṣṇurlokā dhidaivatvam

Viṣṇu creates all living beings. Viṣṇu destroys all the subjects; Viṣṇu gives birth to all the three worlds and Viṣṇu is the presiding deity of all the worlds.

h) *Āmreḍita yamaka* : If at the end of every foot a word is repeated twice, it is known as *āmreḍita yamaka* eg.

vijṛmbhitam nihsvasitam muhurmuhuḥ
kathābhidhānam smaraṇam pade pade

yathā ca te dhyānam idam punaḥ punah
dhruvam gaṭa te rajanī vinā vinā

You are yawning and sighing. You indulge in mentioning her story and remembering her at every step. As you medidate on her again and again it is certain that night had passed without her.

i) *Cāṭur vyavasita yamaka* : When all the feet of the verse consist of same words and syllables, it is called, *cāṭur vyavasita yamaka*

(sa) *vāraṇānāmaya meva kāhaḥ* This construction repeated in all four feet.

This is the time of vāraṇa flower.

This is the season when elephants are free from illness.
This is the time for resistance and warding of the enemies.
This is the time for campaign of war.

j) *Mālā yamaka* : Where the same consonant recurs with different vowels many times. It is an example of *Mālā yamaka*.

halī balī halimalī sūlī khelī lālī jalī
balo balo c calo lakṣo musalī tvābhirakṣatu.

May the powerful Balarāma, who is sportive and faltering in his gait, who has his eyes rolling and who wields a club, protect you.

Bharata mentions only four *alaṁkāras* or poetic figures. Rhetoricians who rose to prominence after Bharata multiplied Bharata's four figures into a number of *alamkaras*, reaching the maximum in Rudraṭa 68. The multiplication of limitless varieties of poetic figures was based on minute differences as well as the making of a large number of sub varieties of each figure. Poetic figures are classified on the basis of word, the word and the sense as *śabdālaṁkāra* and *arthālaṁkāra*. Agnipuraṇa probably the earliest known work which added another category of figures which are both of the word and meaning (*śabdārthālaṁkāra*)

Suggestion in Tamil

Tolkāppiyar makes use of two terms viz. *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* and *iṟaicci*. A detailed discussion on *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* and *iraicci* has already been made in the section on *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* and *iṟaicci*.

A few points may be repeated here, as recapitulatron.

Tolkappiyar introduces the topic of *uḷḷuṟai* for the first time in the *Akaṭ*. While speaking about *kūṟṟu* or utterance at the stage of seperation of lovers. In TP 46 speaks of two kinds of *uvamam* viz. *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* or implied simile and *ēṉai uvamam* or explicit simile and further adds that *ēṉai uvamam* can easily be understood and *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* is not so.

The basic functions of *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* has been given in summarised form earlier. We may reproduce one or two of them here. 1) *uḷḷuṟai* denotes an implied meaning in addition to the explicit sense 2) *uḷḷuṟai* is restricted to only *akam* themes 3) *uḷḷuṟai* is based on the *karupporuḷ* of *akam* theme except *teyvam* or god 4) It has been used by the *akam* characters in their *kūṟṟu* 5) *uḷḷuṟa*i helps in the identification of *tiṇai*

iraicci

iṟaicci has been described in the *Poruḷiyal* and *Kārpiyal* of *Tolkappiyam Poruḷatiāram* and one sutra in *Collatikaram* mentions *iṟaicci*.

1) *iṟaicci* normally refers to the animal kingdom listed as *karupporuḷ* 2) Affection shown by the males towards their mates are generally the topic of *iṟaicci* which is supposed to kindle the affectionate feeling in *talaivaṉ* and will hasten his return 3) *iṟaicc*i mostly reflects the cruelty on the part of the hero. (Nacciṉārkiṉiyar) 4) *iṟaicci* subsumes *ulluṟāi uvamam* also in such case the phrase used with *ulluṟai uvamam* occurs as an adjūnct to the words denoting village, country etc of the hero.

The following meanings are recorded under *uḷḷuṟai* and *iṟaicci*.

uḷḷuṟai uvamam - Indirect suggestion by which an author who does not propose to explicitly state his idea, endeavours, however, to present it through the skillful employment of such telling comparisons as would help people to infer there from what he actually intended to convey.

iṟaicci Distinctive features of each of the *aintinai* relating to five tracts of land (*karupporuḷ*)

iṟaicci pporuḷ : suggestive meaning conveyed indirectly by reference to the distinctive features of the tract or land (*karupporuḷiṉṉullē koḷḷum poruḷ*)

To sum up *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* and *iṟaicci* are made use of in suggestion. Both are used only in the *akam* poetry and the objects used explicitly are those listed under *karupporuḷ*. *ulluṟai uvamam* as its name indicates contains a simile and is used in the form of *kūṟṟu* by the *akam* characters. Tolkappiyar specifies the characters who are entitled to speak, the context in which a speaker can speak and whom it is addressed. The entire structure containing *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* can occur as an adjunct to the village or country of the hero in *iṟaicci* construction. Both *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* and *iṟaicci* are found in the love situation called *pirital* or seperation.

Suggestion theory in Sanskrit

Ānandavardhana, uses the term *dhvani* for suggestion. He has openly admitted his indebtedness to the grammarians for the concept of suggestion, particularly *sphoṭa* of Bhartṛhari. Though Dhvani-theory became the dominant one after eclipsing the other theories existed prior to him, he cannot be considered as the originater of suggestion. Bharata uses the term *vyañjana* in the sense of suggestion. The suggestive power of language is called *vyañjaṇa*. Even the Rgvedic seers have understood the fact that the literal meaning of an ulterance is only a part of its total

meaning ie. an ulterance, may contain an implied sense in addition to its explict meaning. This can be illustrated with a *Ṛk* from the *Ṛgveda*.

uta tvaḥ paśyan na dadarśa vācam
uta tvaḥ śṛṇvan na śṛṇoty enām
uto tvasmai tanvam visasre
jāyeva patyā usatī suvāsaḥ (RV. X. 71.4)

Sees, but does not see; he hears, but does not hear; it is only to the latter that speech reveals herself, like a loving wife to her husband.

In another passage in the *Ṛgveda* the great poets select their words 'winnowing away the chaff from the grain' and only men of equal scholarship and literary taste can fully appreciate their poem.

saktum iva titaunā punanto yatra
dhīro manasā vācam akrata
atrā sakhāyaḥ sakhyāni jānate
bhadraiṣām laksmir nihitādhi vāci (RV. X. 71. 2).

Thus, suggested sense of a verse, apart from its explicit sense was reognised much earlier than the *dhvani* theory of Ānandavardhana came to prominence. However it was Ānandavardhana, who first systsematically formulated the theory of suggestion taking cue from the *sphoṭa* doctrine of grammarians.

Ānandavardhana defines *dhvani* or suggestion as

yātrārthaḥ sabdo vā tamartham upasarjanīkṛtarvārthaḥ
vyaṅktaḥ kāvya viśeṣaḥ sa dhvaṅiriti sūribhiḥ kathitah (Dhv.1.13)

ie. *dhvani* poetry is that poetry in which the literal meaning keep themselves subordinate to the suggested meaning which is more important i.e. prominent.

He divides *dhvani* into three major classes viz., 1) *vastu* or matter, 2) *alaṁkāra* or poetic figure and 3) *rasa* or sentiment ie the suggestion may be of an idea, or a figure or sentiment.

Various types of *dhvani* such as *samlaksya krama* and *asamlakṣya krama* and their subdivisions are explained with illustrations in the *Dhvanyālokam*. All these are already described.

Keeping up with the tradition, Ānanadavardhana claims that *dhvani* or suggestion is the soul of poetry. *(kāvyasyātmā dhvaniḥ)*

To sum up, according to the *dhvani* theory, an ulterance comprises of an explict sense and an implied sense and the latter is prominent in a *kāvya*. *Dhvani* may be suggestive of an idea, or a poetic figure or a sentiment. This suggested sense is not understood by a mere learning in grammer or in dictonary. It is understood only by those who have an insight into the true significance of poetry.

sabdārthajñāna mātenaiva na vedyate
vedyate sa tu kāvyārtha tatvajñaireva kevalam (Dhv.I 7)

Meyppātu and Rasa

Tol. defines *meyppāṭu* as

uyttuṇarviṉṟit talaivaru poruḷāṉ
meyppaṭa muṭippatu meyppāṭākum (TP 519 Ceyyul 205)

If the description of an object is so vivid that one can enjoy it with hair fristling, eyes shedding tears etc. it is called *meyppāṭu*.

He also says

kaṇṇinuñ ceviyiṉun tiṇṇitiṉ uṇaru
muṇarvuṭai māntark kallātu teriyiṉ
naṉṉayap poruḷkoḷeḷḷeṇṇaruṅ kuraittē

(TP 275 Meyppatu - 27)

The *meyppāṭu* of fine quality cannot be understood by those other than they who have correct perspective of things through correct observation and hearing.

Tol describes the *meyppāṭu* of both *akam* and *puram* theme. *Akatiṇai meyppātukaḷ* may be divided into three types.

1) *kaḷavukkālameyppātukal*

2) *kaṟpukkala meyppaṭukal*

3) *varaivukku nimittamāṉa meyppatukal*

1) ***Kaḷavukkāla meyppātukal***

a) *meyppātu* or physical manifestations assigned to this stage are 24. It spans a period beginning from the time of meeting of lovers upto the time of their love being exposed ie. upto the time of marriage or elopement. These twenty four are subdivided into 6 stages of four each. First tweleve are taken to represent a period from the first meeting of lovers upto their union. The second set covers a period from the union to their secret love being exposed.

b) *pirivukāla meyppāṭukaḷ* or the physical manifestation during the time of separation are 20.

c) *varaivukkāla meyppāṭukaḷ* or the emotions that manifest on the body of the heroine *(talaivi)* are 8. These *meyppāṭukal* are said to expedite the public wedding which the hero due to some reason is delaying.

2) ***Kaṟppukkāla meyppāṭukaḷ***

Meyppātu of this stage are listed as 11.

All these are listed in the proceeding pages.

Tolkāppiyar speaks of eight *meyppātus* first in *Meypāṭṭiyal*. The names are *nakai, aḷukai, iḷivaral, maruṭkai, accam, perumitam, vekuḷi and uvakai* (TP 2). Again he brings in these eight *meyppāṭu* in the *Uvamaiyiyal*. (TP 264)

3) *Varaivukku nimittamāṉa meyppatukal*

Bharata's eight *rasas* are : *śṛṅgara* or, erotic, *hāsya* or comic, *karuṇa* or pathetic, *raudra* or furious, *vīra* or heroic, *bhayānaka* or terrible, *bibhatsa* or odious and *adbhuta* or marvellous. The *sthāyībhāva* or permanent or abiding mental state are *rati* or love, *hāsa* or laughter, *śoka* or sorrow, *krodha* or anger, *utsāha* or energy, *bhayam* or fear, *jugupsā* or disgust, *vismaya* or astonishment.

Vyabhicāribhāvas or transient mental state are 33. They are : 1) *nirveda* or despondency, 2) *glāni* or sinking or weakness 3) *śaṅkā* or apprehension, 4) *asūyā* or jealousy or envy 5) *mada* or intoxication or pride, 6) *śrama* or fatigue 7) *ālasyam* or indolence, 8) *dainyam* or depression 9) *cintā* or anxiety, 10) *moha* or infatuation or distraction 11) *smṛti* or recdection 12) *dhṛti* or fortitude, 13) *vrīḍā* or bashfulness, 14) *capalatā* or in constancy 15) *harṣa* or joy, 16) *āvega* or excitement, 17) *jaḍatā* stupor, 18) *garva* or conceit or arrogance, 19) *viṣāda* or despair, 20) *autsukya* or impatient curiosity, 21) *nidrā* or sleep 22) *apasmāra* or loss of memory, 23) *svapna* or dreaming, 24) *prabodha* or awakening, 25) *amarṣa* or indignation, 26) *avahittha* or dissimulation, 27) *ugratā* or cruelty, 28) *mati* or thought fulness, 29) *vyādhi* or sickness, 30) *unmāda* or madness, 31) *maraṇa* or death, 32) *trāsa* or fright, and 33) *vitarka* or deliberation.

Sāttvikabhāvas

Sāttvikabhāvas are listed as eight. They are : 1) *stambha* or paralysis, 2) *sveda* or perspiration, 3) *romāñca* or horripilation, 4) *svarasāda* or feebleness in the voice, 5) *vepathu* or tremour, 6) *vaivarṇya* or change of colour, 7) *aśru* or tears, and 8) *pralaya* or loss of consciousness.

Thus, Bharata lists 49 *bhāvas* ie 8 *sthāyī bhāva*, 8 *sāttvikabhāva* and 33 *vyabhicāribhāva* and explains that the *sthāyibhāvas* are the basis of *rasa* and supreme among the *bhāvas*.

Bharata, defines the process of *rasāsvāda* or *rasa* realization in his *rasasutra* (*vibhāvānubhāva vyabhicāri samyogād rasa nispattiḥ*. The proces of realization explained in these sutra of Bharata has been interpreted differently by different scholars. Four main interpreters are Lollata, Śaṅkuka, Bhaṭṭanāyaka and Abhinavagupta. Lollaṭa, who is a Mīmamsaka believes that the *rasa* is produced in the hero or heroine the spectator ascribes it to the actor because of skillful acting and the spectator's delight is based on the appreciation of the realistic acting. Śaṅkuka, a *Naiyayika*, considers *rasa* to be an inference. The *sthāyibhāva* in the original hero in inferred to exist is the actor though actually it does not exist in him. The spectator forgets the difference between the original hero and the actor, and infers the *rasa* in the actor. These two interpretations fail to explain how the spectater gets aesthetic pleasure by witnessing tragedies. Bhaṭṭanāyaka's theory of enjoyment of *rasa* lays stress on the subjective aspect of *rasa* as the aesthetic experience of the spectator. He destinguishes the poetic language from the ordinary language. Poetic language, according to him, has two functions *bhāvakatva* and *bhojakatva* in addition to the primary function *abhidhā*. *Bhāvakatva* is the power of universalization. (*sādharaṇī karaṇa*) which strips the *bhāvas* of their individual and personal aspects and generalizes them in the minds of the spectators endowed with the power of imagination; and *bhojakatva* is the power by which the *sthāyibhāva* reaches its climax and is enjoyed by the spectators.

At that stage the spectater's hearts are enlarged and their emotions sublimated and they find themselves lifted from the plane of their sordid private lives to the plane of collective human existence. This experience is what is called *rasa dasa* or the state of having realized *rasa*. This condition of the spectator is akin to Aristotle's catharsis. The difference between Aristotle's catharsis and Bharata's *rasa* realization is that the former speaks of it only with reference to tragedy whereas the latter's

theory covers all the emotions. The concept of *sādharaṇīkaraṇa* embraces all poetry and all emotions that surge in the human mind. Catharsis and *sādharaṇī karaṇa* are thus identical in their effect, both lead to enlargement, collective ecstasy, rapture loss of self, elevation and exaltation. Both transport us to the realm of transeendental aesthetic experience. (Singhal: 1977, p 55)

Abhinavagupta, maintains that *rasa* is realized through suggestion. According to him *sthāyibhāvas* as well as *vyabhicāribhāvas* are dormant in the minds of the spectators and are roused by the stimulas of *vibhāvas* etc. and attain the state of *rasa*. He says that *rasa* is suggested by the power of *vyañjana* or suggestion.

Bharata, gives in detail the qualification expected of spectators (NS.VI.49). The ideal reader or spectator is called by Bharata *sumanas* (one with a refined mind) and by Abhinavagupta *sahṛdaya* or one with the feeling heart). Such a reader's sensibility is so trained that he can attune his heart to that of the poet.

A brief outline of literary theme and literary theories postulated in *Tolkāppiyam-poruḷatikāram* and Sanskrit *alaṁkāra* texts, is given in the proceding pages. Let us attempt to list the similaritees and the differences between Tamil and Sanskrit tradition. It can be discussed under two broad heads, viz., 1) shared topics and 2) approach.

A) Shared topics

1) Both Tolkāppiyar and Bharata enumerate the elements which are expected to be in a poetry whereas Tolkappiyar speaks about the literary theme of *akam* and *puram* poetry, Bharata, on the other hand specifies the items which are essential in a dramatic poetry. Since the concept of poetry according to Tolkappiyar is *akam* and *puram* poetry and Bharata is concerned with *kāuya* ie. dramatic poetry. Later

critics, in the Sanskrit tradition distinguishes a body and a soul of poetry (*kāuyaśarīra and kāvyātmā*).

2) Both Tamil and Sanskrit poems deal with the different kind of love-situation, such as union, seperation and so on.

3) Literary theories such as emotion, simile, suggestion, propriety and so on, are discussed in both *Tolkāppiyam-poruḷatikaram* as well as works on Sanskrit criticism.

The above mentioned three aspects of poetry are found to be common to both tradition.

B) Approach

1. *Defination of Poetry*

Poetry is defined in accordance with their concept. Tolkāppiyar defines a poetry in *Ceyyuḷiyal* by enumerating various elements which a poetry should comprise of. According to Tolkāppiyar, poetry menas either of *akam* or *puram* theme. In accordance with his concept, he describes poetry dividing the literary theme into two major classes and mentions the essential elements of *akam* and *puram* poetry.

Bharata, the father of Sanskrit Dramaturgy conceives *kāvya* as dramatic poetry. As such he discusses, *kāvyalakṣaṇa*, relating to dramatic poetry. Later critics speak of the body and soul of poetry (*Kāvya sarīra and kāvyātmā*). Bharata, who covers all the aspects such as emotion, simile and so on, never talks of soul of poetry although he stresses the importance of *rasa* or sentiment. It was later critics such as Viśvanātha says that *rasa* is the soul of poetry (*kāvyam rasātmakam*). Rhetoricians who immediately follow Bharata, though stress the importance of poetic figure (*alaṁkāra*) in a *kāvya* do not argue for the case of soul of poetry.

Rīti school claims that *rīti* is the soul of poetry (*rītirātmā kāvyasya*) and Ānandavardhana, the proponent of *dhvani*-doctrine, establishes *dhvani* as the soul of poetry (*kāvyasyātmā dhvaniḥ*)

Sanskrit critics, starting from Bhāmaha speak about the purpose of *kāvya* (*kāuyaprayojana*), the qualifications of poet, sources of poetry, definition of a *kāvya*, classification of a *kāvya*, according to its form, the flaws, the merits, and the poetic figure, style (*rīti*), *dhvani* and so on.

2. ***Litery theme***

Tamil classifies literary theme in two major classes, viz., *akam* and *puram*. Five fold divisions of land, three fold classification of subject matter, five fold divisions of love situations, according to the land division (*tiṇai*) and so on are discussed on the basis of *tiṇai* concept. Introduction of the concept of *tiṇai* is specific to Tamil tradition.

Though Sanskrit tradition also deals with all these topics, *tiṇai* concept is absent in Sanskrit poetry. Unlike in *Tolkāppiyam* which speaks of the stages *kaḷavu* and *kaṟpu*, Sanskrit tradition is mainly concerned with the love of the couple, be it union or separation or sulkṅg (*ūṭal*).

These topics are not treated within a particular frame work. Similarly one can notice the love affair and war expeditions of the hero described in the same literary composition. The topic of love in seperation is dealt with under *vipralambha-śṛṅgāra* and this situation is mostly described in case of married couples. Thus, though some common topics are being dealt with, in both traditions, one can notice the difference in the treatment as pointed out above. It should also be mentioned that there is no second opinion as to its indegenous nature of Tamil literary theme.

3. *Literary theories*

As stated earlier, there is no formulation of literary theories in Tamil. Three items, viz. *meyppāṭu, uvamai* and suggestion can be identified as comparable with the *rasa, upamā* and *dhvani* of Sanskrit critics.

Meyppāṭu

Divergent views have been expressed by different scholars regarding the treatment of *rasa* in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata and *meyppāṭu* in the *Meypāṭṭiyal* of *Tolkāppiyam Porulatikāram.* We may quote a few of the views expressed earlier.

"The most striking parallel is that of *Tolkāppiyam Porulatikaram* 251 which enumerates the eight moods and their physical manifestation with the eight *rasa's* of Bharata's Nātyaśstra VI. 15. I am quite convinced that in this point. *Tolkappiyam Porulatikāram* is indebted to a Sanskrit source or sources". (Zvelebil: 1975, p. 71)

"The next two sections of Tolkāppiyam treating of *Bhāva* and *upamā* may well be regarded as interpolations. Meyppatu's are equivalent of the Sanskrit *Bhāva* and this whole *iyal* would seem to depend upon Sanskrit dramatic poetry". (Marr : 1985, p.56).

However, he admits that "*Meyppāttiyal* is a further elaboration of love as subject Tolkāppiyam elaborates only that which pertains to love, *uvakai* though the *bhāvas* include emotions other than love.

'In the *Meypāṭṭiyal* we encounter an obvious attempt to incorporate the Sanskrit *bhāvas/rasas* into Tamil poetics" (Norman Cutler: 1987. p.61)

Subramanya sastri, states some corresponding terms from Sanskrit for the terms used in the *Meypāṭṭyal. cuvaikkum porul* corresponds to *vibhāva, poriuṇarvu* is *anuhāva, maṉakkuṟippu* corresponds to *sthāyibhāva, cattuvam* or *viṟal* is *sāttvikabhāva* (1954). Perāciriyar, the

commentator says that *cuvaipporul* are the causes of sentiment of ***Rasa*** and correspond to the *vibhāvās* Determinants. *cuvaiyeuṇarva* are the sign's or indications of sentiment and correspond to the ***anubhāvas***, the consequents. *Manakkuṟippu* are the mental states the ***sthāyībhāvas***. *Viral* or *cattuvam* are the *sāttvikabhāvas* the temperamental states. All these 32 are specifically referred to as *Meyppāṭu* by Per. in his commentary on the next *cūttiram* 250 from which it is clear that Per. regarded *meyppāṭu* as the equivalent of the Sanskrit trem *bhāva* (Joḥn Marr. p.57)

Apparently there is some misunderstanding about the *rasa* theory of Bharata and the *meyppaṭu* described by Tolkappiyar. It is also clear from the commentary quoted above, this confusion regarding the real purport of *rasa* in Sanskrit and *meyppāṭu* in Tolkāppiyam started right from the commentator's time and the modern scholars blindly followed the interpretation of the commentators with out even bothering to think what Sanskrit and Tamil tradition mean by these terms.

Simile

Tolkappiyar does not seem to accept poetic figures as embellishment to poetry. He does not include *uvamai* or simile as one of the constituents of a poetry while enumerating 34 terms which a poetry should consist of (Ceyyuḷ.1) Yet, he has devoted one full section for *uvamai* in *Poruḷatkāram*. Tolkāppiyar classifies *uvamam* into two major types, *uḷḷuṟai uvamam*, and *ēṉai uvamam* (implicit simile and explicit simile). He has included *kūṟṟu* as one amongst the constituents. ***uḷḷuṟai uvamam*** is made use of by the speakers in their utterances. (*Kūṟṟu*). *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* and *iṟaicci* are the terms used for suggestion. As such ***uvamam*** forms the basis for *ulluṟai uvamam*. Therefore, Tolkāppiyar must have felt that it is necessary to explain *uvamam* the knowledge of which is essential in suggestive expressions.

According to some scholars, *Uvamaiyiyal* is introduced on the Sanskrit model. If it is on Sanskrit model, why Tolkāppiyar has chosen only one type of *uvamai* when Bharata mentions 4 kinds of *upamā?* Therefore it is difficult to accept such proposition unless we have some convincing answers for his choice of only one of the poetic figure (starting from 4 of Bharata to several figures later)

Sanskrit theorists consider the *alaṁkaras* or poetic figure as the embellishment adding charm and beauty to the poetry. Sanskrit theorists beginning from Bhāmaha recognizes the importance of *upamā* or poetic figure.

Thus, one may conclude that according to Tolkappiyar *uvamai* or simile is basic for *kūṟṟu,* one of the devices introduced in *akam* poetry as such it forms part of poetry.

Suggestion

Tolkāppiyar uses the terms *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* and *iṟaicci* for suggestion. Sanskrit critics use the term *dhvani* for suggestion. *uḷḷuṟai uvamam* and *iṟaicci* in Tamil and *dhvani* in Sanskrit resembles one another only in its capacity to suggest some other sense apart from its explicit sense. In the case of Tamil poetry, *ulluṟai uvamam* and *iṟaicci* are limited to only *akam* poetry and mainly based on *karupporuḷ* listed. But, *dhvani* in Sanskrit has much wider application . It is not restricted only to love theme. A poet can make use of *dhvani* in any kind of poetry. It is claimed that *dhvani* is the soul of poetry. Poetry, according to *dhvani-school* obtains charm because of its suggested sense. In other words the suggested meaning becomes prominent in the *dhvani* poetry.

Some scholars equate the concepts *iraicci* with *dhvani* of Sanskrit theorists. As stated above, *iraicci* refers to the suggestive meaning conveyed by the *karupporuḷ.*

Relative Chronology

Chronology of any ancient text remains controversial. However those scholars who propose one tradition as the model for the other, assume that the borrower is anterior in date to the posterior. In the case of *Tolkāppiyam*, no definite date has been fixed so for, nor it is possible; so also for Bharata's *Nāṭyasastra*. It is reasonable to consider both Tolkāppriyar and Bharata as contemporaneous since some scholars assign them to pre-Christion era. However, it does not help to establish that Tolkāppiyar had written sections on *Meyppāṭnu* and *Uvamai* on the model of Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Unless we get supportive evidence to say that Bharata's *Nāṭyasatra* was popular even at the time of Tolkāppiyar no conclusive statement can be made in this regard.

Some scholars have argued that the relevant sections are interpolation. Assuming that *Meypattiyal* and *Uvamaiyal* are later additions, how to account for the inclusion of *meyppatu*, *kūṟṟu* etc as the constituent elements of *ceyyul?*

□□□

VI. Conclusion

A brief outline of literary theme and literary theories as discribed by Tolkappiyar and in Sanskrit *alaṁkāra* texts have been presented in the section II and III. The section II gives a summary of Tolkappiyar's classification of literary themes into *akam* and *puram*, the characteristic features of *akam* poetry and a discussion on the treatment of *Meyppāṭu*, *uvamai*, *uḷḷuṟai uvamai* and *iṟaicci*.

Section III discusses the evolution of Sanskrit *kāvya* and Sanskrit poetic criticism, followed by a detailed description of *rasa, upamā* and *dhvani* as explained in the Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, rhetorics as expounded by the rhetoricians beginning from Bhāmaha and *dhvani* of Ānanda vardhana's *Dhvanyāloka* and *locana* of Abhinavagupta,

Next section (IV) a comparison presents the topic under two main heads viz., (i) literary theme and (ii) literary theories. These two again is subdivided into two as common topics or shared topics and approach for the sake of convenince for comparison. The similarities and diffrences in the topics dealt with and the different approach followed by these two tradition have been pointed out. Then follows a few views expressed on the relationship between these two traditions. As the views are expressed mainly based the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata and *Tolkāppiyam Paruḷatikāram*, a brief discussion on the relative chronology is also included here. As mentioned already the Sanskrit theorists except Bharata, are posterior to Tolkāppiyar by many centuries, this comparison is mainly between the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata and *Tolkāppiyam-Poruḷatikāram*. However, as some scholars have pointed out similarity between *iṟaicci*

of Tolkāppiyar and *dhvani* or suggestion postulated by Ānandavardhana, the concept of suggestion also is included is this study with a view to point out the difference between these two.

Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāsra* as is well known, is a treatise on dramaturgy. One can notice that Bharata includes all those elements which a drama is expected to contain. As such he describes the origin of drama, play house, *bhāvas, abhinaya* or gesticulation, characters, (male and female) and so on. Dance, music etc. form a part of drama. This is the proper context to clarity some misunderstanding regarding Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* and the art form *Bharatanāṭya of Tamil Nadu*. The term *nāṭya* in the *Nāṭyaśastra* does not mean a dance. It is a work on dramaturgy which includes dance as well. As one of the elements. Bharata uses other terms such as *nṛtta* to refer to dance. *Nāṭya* in Sanskrit refers to only drama and this word is used for drama even now in modern. Indo-Aryan languages. For instance Maraṭhi, uses the term *nāṭya* for drama even today, and *nāṭyamandir* refers to the theatre. Where as *Bharata nāṭyam* is a dance form indegenous to Tamil Nadu.

Bharata does not differentiate between drama and a poetry as modern scholars do. He uses the form *kāvya* in the sense of dramatic poetry.

The words *nāṭṭiyal, nāṭakam, vaḻakku* are used by Tolkāppiyar also. It seems he refers to the gestures by these terms just as *abhinaya* used by Bharata. Tolkāppiyar at the close of *Meypāṭu*-says that the *meyppāṭu* of fine quality cannot be understood by those other than who have correct perspective of things through correct observation. The words *kaṇṇiṉum* and *ceviyiṉum* used in this sutra (TP.275) (those which are seen by the eyes i.e.. in a stage and those which are heard i.e.. in the form of songs) seems to have been used in the sense of dramatic poetry. Though it is generally accepted that there was no drama in Tamil at that period, yet, *caṅkam* classics have been described as dramatic monologue. This leads to a question as to whether Tolkāppiyar makes any reference to

rasika (skt)? Tolkāppiyar has used the word *uṇarvuṭai māntar* in this sutra. The sense denoted by this word, definitely refers to *sahṛdaya* or connoisseur of *Dhvani* school. Though Tolkāppiyar has touched several aspects of poetics, much earlier than the theories of Sanskrit literary critics it is surprising to note that it failed to draw the attention of his followers to an extent to develop them into various schools as it happened in the case of Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstrā,* the earliest work on Sanskrit poetics.

Before we conclude, it is worth mentioning to quote Tamilaṇṇal's opinion regarding our ancient poeticions. As both Bharata and Tolkāppiyar refer to their predecessors, it is not appropriate to say one tradition has borrowed from the other. It is natural to find several common elements in our culture. However, they have postulated theories in accordance with the tradition they were associated (Tamilaṇṇal : 1985. 185)

The following are the observations of the author.

1) Existence of a tradition of literary criticism prior to *Tolkāppiyam* may be discerned from *Tolkāppiyam* sutras
2) Though Tolkāppiyar was knowledgeable in Sanskrit tradition, his description of literary themes show that it is within the framework of *tiṇai* concept. This concept is unique in Tamil.
3) Tolkāppiyar's contribution to the subject is original and uninfluenced by Sanskrit theories of poetry, since more differences can be observed between these two traditions in their approaches.
4) Sanskrit literary works except the *Nāṭyaśāstra* are chronologically placed later than the *Tolkāppiyam*.
5) Influence of Sanskrit tradition on *Tolkāppiyam* probably originated from the commentaries since the commentators like Peraeiriyar attempted to apply Sanskrit theories on Tolkāppiyam sutras in their interpretation. *Tolkāppiyam,* as it is, does not reflect Sanskrit

techniques. It does not mean to denigrate the position of the commentators. The commentaries are as much essential, as the sutras, however, one should always keep in mind the gap in time and space between the original writer and the commentators. It is very important to be cautious in arriving at any conclusion.

6) *Tolkāppiyam* tradition of poetics, has been broken after Tolkāppiyar that explains why Tolkāppiyar's views have not been systematically formulated by his followers as in the Sanskrit tradition.

One last point is the question of relevance of such comparative study when more differences than similarities are noticed in the Tamil and Sanskrit tradition. Unless we know the kind of techniques which are used in reading a poem of the ancient traditions, we will not be able to appreciate Tolkāppiyar's *uḷḷuṟai uvamam, iṟaicci* etc. properly. Therefore, such comparative studies are essential to understand Tolkāppiyam in a proper perspective.

□□□

Bibliography

Text and Translation

Sanskrit

Abhinavagupta. 'Abhinavabhārati' (commentary on Bharata's Natyasastra. See Bharata.

- 'Locana' commentary on Ānandavardhana's *Dhvanyaloka* see Ānandavardhana.

Ānandavardhana - *Dhvanyaloka*. Edited with an Introduction, English Translation and notes by K. Krishnamoorthy, Dharwar: Karnatak university, 1975.

- *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana *udyota* I, II. Edited with an English exposition by Bishnupāda Bhattacharya 2 vols Calcutta. Firma K.L. Mukhapādhyāya, 1956-1972.

- *Dhvanyāloka* with *Locana* and Balapriya commentaries. Edited with notes by Pattabhirāma śastri. Baṇaras : Chowkhamba Sanskrit. Series office. 1940.

- The *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana with the *Locana* of Abhinavagupta. Translated by Danier H.H. Ingals, Jeffrey Masson and M. U. Pattawardhan cambrige, 1990.

Bharata Nāṭyaśāstra, Vds. 4. Baroda oriental Institute, 1964.

The Nāṭyaśāstra chaps. 1-27. Edited with translation by Manmohan Ghosh. 2 Vols". Calcutta. Manisha Granthaloya. 1967.

- *Nāṭyaśāstra* with 'Abhinavabhārati' by Abhinavagupta. Edited with Sanskrit commentary 'Madhusūdani' and Hindi

Translation by Madhusūdana Shastri. 3 vols. Varanasi. Banaras Hindu University (BHU 1971-981)

Dandin *Kāvyadarsa*, Edited with commentary by Pandit Rangacharya Raddishastri 2nd Ed, Poona : Bhandarkar oriental Research Institute. 1970.

Tamil

Tolkāppiyam. Poruḷatikāram : Akattiṇai iyal, Purattiaiyiyal, Kaḷaviyal, Kaṟpiyal, Poruliyal with Naccinarkiniyar's commentary. Tirunelveli, the south India Saiva siddhan'a publishing society. 1971.

Tolkāppiyam poruḷatikāram Meypāttiyal Uvamaiyal, Ceyyaḷiyal, Marapiyal with Peraciriyar's commentary. Tirunelveli TSISS. 1971.

Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram Part I *Akattiṇai iyal. Purattiṇaiiyal* with English Translation and English commentary by P.S. Subramanya Sastri, Mylapore, Madras, 1949.

Tolkāppiyam. Poruḷatikaram. Part 2. *Kaḷaviyal, Kaṟpiyal* and *Poruḷiyal* with English translation and English commentary by P.S. Subramanya Sastri. Mylapore. 1952.

Tolkāppiyam. Poruḷatikaram. Meypāṭṭiyal and Uvamaiyal. English Translation and commentary by P. S. Subramanya Sastri in Journal of Oriental Research. Madras xxi. 1953 and xxiii (1954).

Tolkāppiyam. Poruḷatikāram. Ceyyaḷiyal Translation and English Commentary by P. S. Subramanya Sastri in JORM xxii. (1954), xxiii (1954) and xxiv (1955).

Tolkāppiyam. Poruḷatikāram. vol. I *Akattinaiyiyal* and *Kaḷaviyal*. vol ii. *Karpiyal* and *Poruḷiyal* Text, English Translation and notes,

by E. S. Varadaraja Aiyar. Amnamalai Nagar Amnamalai University. 1948.

Tolkāppiyam in English with critical studies by S Ilakkuvanar. Madurai Kuraḷ Neṟi Publishing House. 1963.

Tolkāppiyam uraivaḷam Porulatikaṟam Akattiṇaiyiyal by A. Sivalinganar. International Institute of Tamil studies, Chennai. 1991.

Tolkappiyam. Poruḷatikaram. uraivaḷam Poruḷiyal by A. Sivalinganar. IATS. Chennai. 1994.

Tolkappiyam. Poruḷatikaram. (urai vaḷam) Ceyyuḷiyal, by A. Sivalinganar. IATS, Chennai. 1977.

Works in English and Tamil

Bhat, G. K. *Bharata Nāṭyamañjari*, Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1975.

Chaitanya, Krishna. Sanskrit Poetics, Bomaby. Asia Publishing House. 1965.

Chari, L. K. Sanskrit critcism. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press 1990.

De. S. K. History of Sanskrit Poetics 2nd Ed. Rev. 2vols. in I. Calculta. Firma K. L. Mukhopādhyaya. 1966.

Gerow, Edwin. A Glossary of Indian Figures of speech. The Hague. Mouton. 1971.

Gerow, Edwin . Indian Poetics vol. 5 fasc. 3 of A History of Indian Literature Edited by Jan Gonda, Wiesbeden ofto Harrasso witz., 1977.

Kane, P. V. History of Sanskrit Poetics 4th Ed. Banaras, Motilal Banarasidas, 1971.

Keith A. B. A History of Sanskrit Literature (1920) Reprint London, Oxfold University Press. 1966.

-- The Sanskrit Drama, in its origin, Development, theory and Practice 1924. Reprint London Oxfold University Press. 1959.

Krishnamoorthy K. Essays in Sanskrit Criticism. Dharwar, Karnatak University 1964.

- *Dhvanyāloka* and its critics, Mysore Kavyalaya Publishes 1968.

Kulkarni, V. M.Ed. Some aspects of Rasa theory. Patna, Bhogilal Leharchand Institute of Indology, 1986.

Kunjunni Raja, K. Indian Theories of meaning, Adyar, The Adyar Library and the centre. 1977. (1st Ed. 1963).

- Makers of Indian literature Ānandaverdhana, Delhi, Sahitya Academi 1995.

Pande, Kantichandra. Comparative Aesthetics. vol. I Banaras, Chowkhamba Sanskrit series. 1956.

Sankaran, A Some concepts of Literary criticism in Sanskrit (1926). Reprint New Delhi Orintal Books Reprint corp. 1973.

Sharma, Mukund Madhav. The Dhvani Theory in Sanskrit Poetics, Varanasi Chowkhamba Sanskrit series. 1962.

Shekhar, Indu. Sanskrit Drama, Its origin and Decline E. J. Brill Leiden, 1960.

Singhal, R. L. Aristotle and Bharata. A comparison. Study of their theories of Drama. Published by the author at 423 Sect. 23-D Chandigarh, Punjab.

Srinivasa Iyengar, K. R. The Adventures of Literary Criticism, New Delhi, Sterling Publication 1985.

Warder, A. K. Indian Kāvya Literature vol. I. Literary criticism, Delhi, Motilal Banarasidass, 1973.

Winternitz, M. - History of Indian Literature vol. III. Translated from German into English by Subhadra Jha. Delhi. Motilal Banarasidas. 1963.

Hart III. George L. The poems of Ancient Tamil, Their milieu and their Sanskrit counterpart. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of Califormia press. 1975.

- Relation between Tamil and Sanskrit Literature in A History of Indian LIterature vol. 10. Ed. by Jan Gonda Wiesbaden

Kailasapathy, K. Tamil Heroic Poetry, Oxfold, Oxford University Press, 1968.

Marr John. The Eight Anthologies. Madras, Institute of Asian Studies, 1985.

Meenakshisundaram, T. P. Tolkāppiyar's Literary Theory, Proceedings of the International conference seminar of Tamil studies, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Apr. 1966. vol II.

Sundaramurthy, G. Early literary theories in Tamil: A comparison with Sanskrit Theories, Madurai, Sarvodaya Ilakkiyappaṉṉai 1974.

Zvelebil, K. V. Tamil literature,. E.J.Brill, Leiden, -öln 1974.

Zvelebil. it, K.V. Literary convention in Akarm Poerty. Chennai. Institute of Asian studies. 1986.

In Tamil

Caṅka Ilakkiyak kaṭṭurakal - karuttaraṅkam Tamil palkalaikkaḻakam Thanjavur 1954

Cinivasan. Ra. *Caṅka ilakkiyattl uvamat kal* Chennai Aniyakam 1973.

Subbu Riddiy. N. *Akattiṉaikoḷkaikaḷ.* Parinilaiyam Chennai. 1987

Thamiḻaṉṉal *Caiṅka ilakkiya-oppītu ilakkiyakoḷkaikal* Madurai Minatchi Puttaka Nilaiyam. Colai Nūlake veḷīyītu. 1984.

□□□

Index

Tamil

a

Akattinaiyiyal (=Akat.) : 3,5, 6,13,19.
akattinai : 6,8,113.
akaṁ. : 3,5-8,11,12,17,27,31, 35,98,113,116,118,121,123.
accam : 16,37,113.
aṭiyor : 12.
aṇi : 103.
alar : 7.
aḻukai : 16,37,113.
aṟivar : 7.

i

iyal : 56,119.
iyarkaippuṇarcci : 6.
iraṅkal : 10.
iruttal : 10.
iḷavēṉil : 9.
iḷivaraṉ : 16,17,37,113.
iḷaiyōr : 7.
iraicci : 3,4,7,25,31,33-35, 105,109,110,120-123,126.

u

uṭanurai : 27,28.
uṇarvu : 36.
uṇā : 10.
uri : 6,11,33,99.
uripporuḷ : 18,11,12,31.
uvakai : 16,115.
Uvamiyiyal : 3,5,13,19,26,102, 113,122.
uvamam/uvamai : 3,6, 13, 17, 18, 24, 26 - 28 35,101-104,109,118,120,122,123.
aṭukkiya uvamam : 14,19.
acca uvamam : 18.
avala uvamam : 17.
iḷivaral uvamam : 17.
uruva uvamam : 15,16.
uvakai uvamam : 18.
orīiya uvamam : 20.
cuṭṭikkūra uvamam : 14.
cuṭṭikkuriya uvamam : 14.
taṭumāru uvamam : 20.
nakai uvamam : 17
payaṉ uvamam : 15,16.
perumita uvamam : 18.
poruḷe uvamam : 19.
moruṭkai uvamam : 17.
nakai uvamam : 17.
vekuli uvamam : 18.
vērupaṭavamta uvamam : 19.

uvamappōli : 21,24,25.
payavama : 22.
pirappuvama : 23.
meyyuvama : 23.
viṉaiyuvama : 22
uḻavaṉ : 12.
uḻiñai : 5.
uḷḷappuṇareci : 6
uḷḷuṟai uvamam : 3,4,6,7,18,21, 25,26-28,30,33,35,102,105, 109, 110,120,121,123.

ū

ūṭal : 7,10,118.
ūr : 10,11.

ē

ēṟpāṭu : 9

ai

aintiṇai: 8,31.

ō

ōtal : 12.

k

karu : 6
karupporuḷ : 8,10,11,24,27,30, 33,35,99,109,110.
kaḷavu : 6,7,12,13,98,99,118.
kaḷaviyal : 3,5,6.
kaṟpu : 6,7,12,13,26,98.
kaṟpiyal ; 3,5,7,31,109.
kaṟpumaṇam : 7,99.
kāñci : 5.
kāṭu : 9,11.
kātal : 8.
kamakkiḻatti : 1.
kār : 9.
kālai : 8.
kāṉavar : 11.
kiḻatti :
kiḻavaṉ : 24,25.
kuṉṟakkūral : 103.
kuṟiñci : 8,9,10,34.
kūtīr : 9.
kūttāṭi : 9.
kūttu : 9.
kūttukkaḻaṟi : 9.
kūttuppāṭṭu : 9.
kūttan : 9.
kūṟṟu : 12,24,25,27,109,120,121.
kaikkiḷai : 8,11.

c

ciṟappu : 29.
ciṟupoḻutu: 9.
ceyti : 10,11.
ceyyuḷ : 92,93,120,122.
ceyyuḷiyal : 3,5,7,13,93,103,117, 122.

cevili : 7,12,25.

cēyon : 10.

cuṭṭu : 28.

t

Taṇṭiyalaṁkāram : 1,2.

tantai : 12.

Tamilakam : 11.

talaivaṉ : 6,12,24.

talaivi : 12,24,113.

tiṇai : 6,7,11,27,98,101,118,125.

tīmpuṉal : 9

tumpai : 5

tuṟai : 7

tūtū : 12

teyvam : 10,11,109,101,102,103, 109,116,117,120-126.

Tolkāppiyam : 2,3,5,30,32,92,97 98,120-126.

Tolkāppiyar : 1,2,10,12-15, 19, 21,24,26,27,36,93.94,97, 98,99,101,102,120-124,

tōḻi : 6,7,12,24,25.

n

nakai : 16,17,29,37.

naṇpakal : 9.

naṟṟāy : 6,12.

nāṭṭiyal : 124.

nāṭakam : 78,124.

nilam : 8,9,11.

nilaikkaḷaṉ : 13,14.

nūrpā : 30,36.

neytal : 8-11,25

p

pakal : 8.

pakai : 12.

payaṉ : 27.

parattai : 12,17.

paṟai : 10,11.

pā : 94.

paṅkaṉ : 12.

pālai : 8-12.

pirital : 10,12,110.

pirivu: 6

piṉpaṉi : 9.

puṇarcci : 6.

puṇartal :10.

pulaṉrivalakku

puḷ : 10,11.

puṟattiṇaiyiyal : 5.

puram : 5,7,113,116-118,123.

pū : 10,11.

peyarppeyar : 11.

peruntiṇai : 6,8,11.

perumpoḻutu : 9.

perumitam : 16,37,113.

poruḷ : 8,20,21,35102.

poruḷiyal : 3,5,7,26,28,31,109.

porilatikaram : 1,2,3-5,6,7,92, 109,112,117,119,123.
poriyenarvu : 36.
palutu : 8,9,11.

m

marutam : 8,9,10,25.
maram : 10,11.
marutkai : 16,37,113.
malai : 9.
manakkurikku : 36
marapiyal : 5.

ma

mā : 10,11.
Māranalaṅkāaram : 1.
mālai : 9.
mutal /mutarporal : 6,8,9,11,99.
mutuvenil : 9.
mullai : 8,9,10.
munpani : 9.
munnam :13.
meyppāṭu : 3,4,16,35-40, 102, 103,112,113,118,119,120,121, 122,123,124.
meyppāṭṭiyal : 2,3,5,35,101,113, 119,124.

y

yāl : 10,11.
yāmam : 9.

v

vañci : 9,11.
varunan : 11.
vākai : 5
viṭiyal : 9.
vinaippeyar : 12
vinaivalar : 12
vekuḷi : 16,37,115.
veṭci : 5.
vēṭṭuvan : 12.
venil : 9.

Sanskrit

a

Agnipuāṇa : 48,51,52,108.
aṅka : 57.
Atharvaveda : 61.
adbhuta : 61,114.
adhama : 58.
anukūla : 60.
anuprāsa : 76,83.
anubhāva : 119,69,70,71,73.
anuṣṭulh : 62.
anyonyopama : 13.
Abhijñānaśākuntalam : 59,73.
abhidhā : 115,73.
abhinaya : 60,63,64,65,124.
  āṅgikābhinaya : 64.
  āhāryābhinaya : 65.

citrābhinaya : 66.
vācikābhinaya : 65
sāttvika : 65.
Abhinavagupta : 4,49,51,71, 73,74,84,97,115,116,123
ayosaviprelambhe : 99.
artha : 75,81,95.
arthaguṇa : 81.
arthālaṁkare : 48,79,83,108.
alaṁkāreśastra:2,3,4,44,47,48 49,50,61,65,75,76,77,78,79,82, 83,95,96,102,103,104,108,111, 116,117,121,123.
aviddha : 50.
Alankārasangraha : 76.
avyāpti : 103.

ā

ā todya : 63,64.
Ānandavardhana : 4,46,47,48, 49,50, 51, 52, 63, 83, 84, 86, 90,96,97,102, 110, 111, 112, 117, 123, 124.
ānuvamśya : 62.
ārabhaṭi : 65.
Auciyālamkaṛe : 49.
Aucitya vicaracarca : 49.

i

ihāmṛga : 57.

u

uttama : 58
Uttararāmacaritam : 59,100,101.
utṣāḫa : 67,114.
udāttā : 59.
Udbhaṭa : 4,47,50,77.
upamā : 19,45,46,76,80,83,102, 104, 119,120,121,123.
upamāna : 19,21,45,46.
upamita : 46.
upameya : 19,21.

au

aucitiya : 14.

k

karuṇa : 37,113,67.
kavi : 53.
kāku : 65.
kārikā : 84,62.
kāldāśa : 44,59,73,74,98,99,100.
kāvya : 44,53,54,75,78,95,104, 117,118,123.
kāvyamimaṁsa : 49.
kāvyatma : 95,102,116,117.
kāvyalakṣana : 117.
kāvyadarśa : 19,47.
kāvyālaṁkaṛa : 17,48,47,49,51, 75,77.
kāvyālaṁkaṛa vṛlti : 52,76.

kāvyālaṁkāresamgraha : 47.
kāvyaśarīra : 75,95,102,116,117.
kimvadanti : 100.
Kuntaka : 48,49,51,52.
Kumārasambhavam : 99.
kaiśik : 65.
krīdanika : 64.
kroḍha : 67,89,114.
Kṣemendra : 49,52.

g

gānā : 63,64.
guṇa : 78,79,80,81,82,83,95.
Guṇāḍya : 53

c

cāri : 64.
Cārudatta : 56,101

ch

chandas : 52.
chandas sūtra : 52

j

Jaganatha paṇḍita : 50, 52.
jāti : 66.
jugupsā : 67,114.

ḍ

ḍima : 56.

t

Tritrīthaka : 53.
trotaka : 57.
Therigātha : 53.

d

dakṣiṇa : 66.
Dandin : 2,13,19,47,50,54, 78,79,95,96.
Daśarūpa/Daśarūpaka, : 49.
Dipaka : 76.
divyā : 60.
Duṣyanta, : 59,73,98.
dūti : 65.
dṛśya : 53.
doṣa : 76,79,80,81.

dh

Dhanañjaya : 49,51,52.
dharmi : 63,64.
dhīrā : 59.
dhīralalita : 59.
dhīrodātta : 58.
dhirodāddha : 59.
dhīra praśānta : 58.
dhīralalita : 59.
dhruva : 47,48,50,66.
dhvani : 4,78,83,84,85,87,95, 96, 102, 110, 111,112, 117,119, 121,123, 124,125.

asamlakṣya : 112.
alamkāradhvani : 84, 85, 86.
rasadhvani : 84,86.
vastudhvani : 84.
avivakṣita vācydhvani : 87.
lakṣaṇā mūladhvani : 87.
vivaksirānyapara vācyadhvant : 88.
arthāntara samkramita dhvani : 87.
vivaksita vācyakramadhvani : 87.
asaṁlakṣya kramadhvani : 87,113.
saṁlakṣya vācyakram adhvaṁ : 87.
sabdaśskty udhava dhvani : 89
artha sakty udlhava dhvaṁ : 89,90.
snbdārtjasakty udbhavadhvani : 89,90
Dhvanyāloka : 48,49,84,96, 97, 112,123.
Dhvanyāloka locana : 49,121.

n

naṭa : 55.
nāṭakam : 78,55,124.
nāṭikā : 55,57.
nāṭya : 60,61,64.
nāṭya dharmi : 65.
Nāṭyaśāsbrā : 1,2,37,47,49,51,52, 60,61,62,63,86,120,121,122, 123,124,125.
nāṭyasamgraha : 63.
nāyaka : 66.
nāyikā : 59,65,66.
Nighaṇṭu : 45.
nibhrtā : 59.
Niruktam : 45.

p

Patañjali: 60.
parakīyā: 60.
pāñcālī : 65.
pāṇini : 46,60.
pnaruklavadābhāsa : 76.
prakaraṇa : 56.
pratīya mānārtha : 96.
pravāsa : 100.
pravṛti : 63,64,65.
prahasana : 56.
prekṣya

b

bībhatsa : 37,67,114.
Bṛhat kathā : 53.
Bṛhatsamhitā : 53.

bh

Bhaṭṭa loolata : 71,115.

Bhiṭṭa nāyaka : 51,115.
bhāyam : 67,114.
bhayanka : 67,113.
Bharata : 1,2,4,37,47,49,50,52, 58,59,60,62,67,69,83,86,96-98,103,104,108,110,113-117,119,120-122,124.
Bhavabhuti : 59,100.
bhāṇa : 56.
Bhāmaha : 47,48,50,75,76-78,95,96,122.
Bhāmaha vivaraṇam : 47,67.
Bhāmahālaṁkāra : 47.
Bhāratiya nātyasāstra : 48.
Bhārati : 65.
bhāva : 63,64,65, 114,115,119,120,124.
bhāvakartve : 72,73,115.
Bhoja : 50,51.
Bhojakatva : 73,115

m

maṇḍala : 65
madhyama : 58
Mammaṭa : 49,51,52.
Mahābhāṣya : 46,
Mahimabhaṭṭa : 49,51.
māna : 46,100.
mārga : 79.
Mālavikāgnimibram : 100.
mūrechanā : 66
Meghasandlsam : 98,100.
Mṛcchakatikam : 56,101

y

Yajur veda : 52, 60.
Yāska : 45.
yamaka : 83,105,106,107,108.
yogavitralambha : 99.

r

Raghuvaṁśam : 44
rasāsvāda : 114.
raṅga : 63.
ratī : 67,100,114.
rasa : 3,4,47,60,63,64,69,71,72, 75,78,84,86,95,96,98,99,111, 112,113,114,115,116,117,119,124,
rasasūtra : 71,114.
Rasagangadhara : 50.
Rāja sekhara :49,52.
Rāma : 59.
Rāmāyaṇa : 51,53,59,86,101.
Rāvaṇa : 59.
rītī : 48,50,52,78,79,81,83,95,117.
Rudraka : 48.
Rudraṭa : 49,50,77,78,95,109.
Rudradāman : 53.
Rūpaka : 57,76,86,104,105.
Regvede : 44,45,52,57,110.
Rgveda Prātiśākhya : 52,53.
raudra : 67,98,113.

l

lakṣaṇa : 65.'
Lollaṭa : 51,61,71,72,115.

lalitā : 59,
lokadharmī : 65.
locana : 84,97.

V

vakrokti : 48,96.
vakroktijīvitam : 48.
vācya : 96.
Vāmana: 47,50,51,78,81,82,83, 95,96.
Vālmīki : 53,86.
Vikramorvasiyam : 100.
vipralambha ślṅgara 99,100.
vibhāva : 69,70,71,72,73.
ālambanā vibhāva : 70
uddīpana vibhāva : 70
Viśvanātha : 50,52,117.
Viṇudharmcttara puraṇa : 48,51.
viṣmaya : 67,114.
vīthi : 56.
vīra : 67,98,113.
vṛttl : 63,64,65.
Venisamhāra : 89.
vyañjana : 83,110.
vyabhicāribhēribhēva : 69,70, 71,73,90,114,116.
vyāyoga : 56.

S

Śaṅkuka : 72,73.
śaṯha : 59.
sabda : 75,81,95.
śabdageṇe :81.
śabdālaṁkara : 48,108.
śabdārthālaṁkara
sahṛrdaya : 73,74.
Sahṛdayālaṁkāra : 48
Śaṅkuka : 51,115.
Śāṅkhayanasrauta sūtre : 52.
Śūdraka :89
śṛṅgara : 67,99,113.
śoka : 67,114.
sambogha : 99.
srāvya : 53,54.
vipralambhaśṛ : 9,118.

S

Sattasai : 53
sahrdaya : 73,116,125.
sannyaśn : 59.
samavakāra : 51.
Sahityadarpana : 50.
sātvikabhāva : 70,114,120.
sādhāraṇi : 60.
sādhāramikaraṇa : 72,115,116.
sāmaveda : 60.
sāmanyā : 46.
sāhitya : 44.
siddhi : 63,64.
sthāyibhāve : 37,68,69,71,114, 115,116,120.
sphoṭa : 46,110,111.
svakīyā : 60.

svare : 63,64,66.

h

hāsa : 67,114.
hāsya : 37,67,113.

English

agricuttural land : 8.
arid sand : 8.
Aristotle : 115.
Chari : 51.
Cutler : 119.
De : 51,62,104
deviancy : 96
deviant speech : 96.
Dramaturgy : 47,50,55, 60,117,124.
embellushment : 4,44,48,75,78, 95,96,102,103.
erotic (poetry) : 3,113.
explicit simile : 6,18,21,27,102.
figure (poetic) : 7,75-79,81-86,95,101,104,108,111,112,117,120,121.
generation theory : 71.
generalisation : 72.
hero : 6,7,13,17,22-25,29,32-35,50,56,57,59,98,109,115.
heroine : 6,7,12,13,17,22-24,29,32,5998,115.
inference theory : 72.
implicit simile : 6,18,21,102.
Kane : 44,62.
Krishna murtly : 84.
Krishna chaitanya : 69.
literary critic : 117,119,125.
literary critieism : 1,117,123.
literary theme : 2,3,5,6,7,11, 92,97,98,118,123.
literary theory : 3,7,13,92,97, 101,117,118,123.
littoral region : 8.
Marr, John : 119,120.
metrical pattern : 5,6,63,96.
mountainous region : 8.
pasture land : 8
patient waiting : 10.
physical manifestation : 16,36,37.
pining : 10.
poetics : 1,2,5,44,45,46,47, 63,75, 94, 96,102,125,126.
poetry/poem : 5,7,44,53,54,75, 79,81,92,94-99,102,103,111, 116,117,121,123.
propriety : 117.
prosody : 52,53.
prostitute : 17,22,24,101.
pseudo - simile : 21.
rhetorics : 51.
region (land): 8,9,11,24,25, 98,118.
rhetoricians : 4,19,108,117.
season : 8
sentiment : 1-3,63,67,86,101, 111,117,119.

separation : 6,7,10,12,99,100, 101,110, 113,117,118.
simile : 2,3,6,13,19,20,21,25, 28,102-105,117.
Singhal : 116.
situation (love) : 7,8,10,99, 110,117,118.
Subramanya Sastri : 119.
siggestion : 1-4,25,83,96, 101,104,109, 110,118,121,124.
sulking : 7,10,118.
Sundaramurthy : 14.
time : 8.
tradition : 5,98,99,101,126.
Union : 10,99-101,117,110, 113,118.
utterance : 6,7,12,24,26,120.
zvelebil : 119

உலகத் தமிழாராய்ச்சி நிறுவனம்

சென்னை – 600 113

அண்மை வெளியீடுகள்

பொருள் புதிது	35. 00
ஆளும் தமிழ்	28. 00
புதிய அமைச்சகம் புரிந்த பணிகள்	10. 00
தமிழின் பா வடிவங்கள்	35. 00
சங்க இலக்கியம் – கவிதையியல் நோக்கு	110. 00
நாடக மேடை நினைவுகள்	160. 00
சின்னணைஞ்சான் கதை	65. 00
தொல்காப்பிய இலக்கியக் கோட்பாடுகள்	110. 00
நன்னூல் மூலமும் கூழங்கைத்தம்பிரான் உரையும்	65. 00
யாப்பருங்கலம்	170. 00
மண்டல புருடர் வழங்கிய சூடாமணி நிகண்டு	65. 00
தமிழ் நாடகமேடை முன்னோடிகள்	40. 00
காஞ்சிபுரம் ஏகாம்பரநாதர் கோவில் – ஓர் ஆய்வு	60. 00
திருக்குற்றாலநாத சுவாமி கோயில் வரலாறும் பண்பாடும்	60. 00
வெள்ளுடை வேந்தர் தியாகராயரின் வாழ்வும் பணியும்	65. 00
தமிழ்நாட்டு வரலாற்றில் இலக்கிய ஆதாரங்கள்	100. 00
இந்திய விடுதலைக்கு முந்தைய தமிழ் இதழ்கள், தொகுதி – 1	100. 00
கதிர்வேற்பிள்ளை – தமிழ்ச் சொல்லகராதி, மூன்று பாகங்கள்	600. 00
தொல்காப்பியப் பொருளதிகாரம் – ஆங்கில மொழிபெயர்ப்பு	40. 00
சதாசிவப் பண்டாரத்தார் ஆய்வுக் கட்டுரைகள்	40. 00
பம்மல் சம்பந்த முதலியாரின் உரைநடை நூல்கள், தொகுதி–1	50. 00
பம்மல் சம்பந்த முதலியாரின் உரைநடை நூல்கள், தொகுதி–2	40. 00
நாட்டிய நன்னூல்	25. 00
கன்னடத்தில் காரைக்காலம்மையார் வரலாறு	20. 00
கபிலர்	70. 00
சங்கத் தமிழர் வாழ்வியல்	75. 00
வேதகிரியார் சூடாமணி நிகண்டு	65. 00
தமிழக மேடை நாடகப் பெண் கலைஞர்கள் – குறிப்பேடு	25. 00
Tamil India	40. 00
Studies in Tamil Prosody and Poetics	45. 00
Persona in Tolkapiyam	50. 00
A Grammar of Contemporary Literary Tamil	80. 00
Cilappatikaram (மொ.நூ.ம.ப)	100. 00
Tani pacura togai (மொ.நூ.ம.ப)	30. 00
Dedication (மொ.நூ.ம.ப)	25. 00
Temple chimes (மொ.நூ.ம.ப)	20. 00
Nala venba (மொ.நூ.ம.ப)	45. 00
Tamil Heroic Poems (மொ.நூ.ம.ப)	40. 00